

WRITINGS OF A R MAIN

by A.R. Main

A collection of theological writings, sermons, and essays by A.R. Main, compiled for study and devotional reading.

69 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 00.00. Main, A. R. - Library
2. 01.0. Baptism, Our Lord's Command
3. 01.00. Preface
4. 01.000. Table of Contens
5. 01.001. Baptism: Our Lord's Command
6. 01.002. New Testament Example and Precept
7. 01.003. The Commission
8. 01.004. The Argument from Circumcision
9. 01.005. Jewish Baptism
10. 01.006. Family Baptisms
11. 01.007. Jesus and the Little Ones
12. 01.008. A Pedobaptist Miscellany
13. 01.009. Post-Apostolic Practice
14. 01.010. The Action of Baptism
15. 01.011. The Evil of Infant Sprinkling
16. 02.00.1. First Principles
17. 02.00.2. PREFACE.
18. 02.01. THE BIBLE - 01 - God's Book
19. 02.02. THE BIBLE - 02 - Why Do We Accept the Bible's Claim?
20. 02.03. THE BIBLE - 03 - The Divisions of the Bible
21. 02.04. SIN AND ITS CURE
22. 02.05. JESUS CHRIST - 01 - His Person
23. 02.06. JESUS CHRIST - 02 - His Office
24. 02.07. THE HOLY SPIRIT - 01 - The Work of Inspiration
25. 02.08. THE HOLY SPIRIT - 02 - Spiritual Gifts
26. 02.09. THE HOLY SPIRIT - 03 - Baptism in the Holy Spirit;
27. 02.10. THE HOLY SPIRIT - 04 - The Spirit's Work in Conversion
28. 02.11. THE HOLY SPIRIT - 05 - The Spirit's Work in Sanctification.
29. 02.12. FAITH - 01 - What is Faith?
30. 02.13. FAITH - 02 - How is Faith Produced?
31. 02.14. Faith - 03 - The Importance of Faith.
32. 02.15. Faith - 04 - What Must We Believe to be Saved?
33. 02.16. REPENTANCE - 01 - What is Repentance?
34. 02.17. Repentance - 02 - What Produces Repentance?
35. 02.18. Repentance - 03 - The Results of Repentance.
36. 02.19. CONFESSION - 01 - What is Confession?
37. 02.20. CONFESSION - 02 - What Promises Are Attached to It?
38. 02.21. CONFESSION - 03 - Reasons for the Good Confession.
39. 02.22. BAPTISM - 01 - The Action of Baptism

40. 02.23. BAPTISM - 02 - Subjects of Baptism.
41. 02.24. BAPTISM - 03 - The Significance of Baptism.
42. 02.25. THE CHURCH - 01 - Its Establishment
43. 02.26. THE CHURCH - 02 - Its Membership.
44. 02.27. THE CHURCH - 03 - Its Worship
45. 02.28. THE CHURCH - 04 - Its Ministry
46. 03.00.1. Studies in Ambiguous Texts
47. 03.00.2. FOREWORD.
48. 03.00.3. Table of Contents
49. 03.01. Introductory
50. 03.02. On Searching the Scriptures.
51. 03.03. Nil Desperandum.
52. 03.04. The Question Peter Would Not Answer.
53. 03.05. "Tears, Idle Tears."
54. 03.06. The Gift of the Holy Spirit.
55. 03.07. On Giving Up Our Rights.
56. 03.08. The One Thing Needful
57. 03.09. The Lord's Prayer.
58. 03.10. Making Friends of the Mammon of Unrighteousness.
59. 03.11. The Word's First Word.
60. 03.12. Why Callest Thou Me Good?
61. 03.13. "Baptised for the Dead."
62. 03.14. "Sound Doctrine."
63. 03.15. Mirrored Glory and Transformed Life.
64. 03.16. Glory of God and Peace of Man.
65. 03.17. Faith and Its Assurance.
66. 03.18. Light Which Lighteth Every Man.
67. 03.19. "Not . . . But."
68. 03.20. To the Uttermost.
69. 03.21. Closing Prayer

00.00. Main, A. R. - Library

Main, A. R. - Library
Main, A. R. - Baptism Our Lord's Command
Main, A. R. - First Principles
Main, A. R. - Studies in Ambiguous Texts

01.0. Baptism, Our Lord's Command

BAPTISM OUR LORD'S COMMAND.

CONTAINING A REPLY TO

"THE QUESTION OF BAPTISM,"

BY MR. A. MADSEN,

METHODIST MINISTER. By

A. R. MAIN B.A.

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."-- 1 Thessalonians 5:21.

AUSTRAL PUBLISHING CO., 328.530 Elizabeth Street.

Melbourne.

1913.

Uploaded by djmarko53 to www.biblesupport.com on 5/31/2018

01.00. Preface

PREFACE

This book deals with the subjects and action of baptism, and is intended to help those who are desirous of doing the will of God. Much interest has recently been aroused in the subject of baptism, and much writing has been done on the Pedobaptists side. While this book contains particularly a reply to Mr. Madsen's treatise on The Question of Baptism, recently published with the approval of the Literature Committee of the Methodist Church of Victoria and Tasmania, its interest is not therefore merely ephemeral; for the arguments met herein continually recur. It will be noticed that we have given many quotations concerning baptism from learned Pedobaptists. We may state that none of these are inserted at second-hand. We have sought to verify every quotation. While we trust that we have not misrepresented the teaching of any man, we have, above all, endeavored to be true to the Word of God. No religious question can be rightly settled till it be decided in harmony with the Scriptures. Our work will be abundantly rewarded if some readers are led to study the New Testament with the sincere desire to learn and do the Saviour's will. We have no doubt of the result in that case.

A. R. MAIN.

01.000. Table of Contents

CONTENTS.

PREFACE

Baptism: Our Lord's Command

New Testament Example and Precept

The Commission

The Argument from Circumcision

Jewish Baptism

Family Baptisms

Jesus and the Little Ones

A Pedobaptist Miscellany

Post-Apostolic Practice

The Action of Baptism

The Evil of Infant Sprinkling

01.001. Baptism: Our Lord's Command

Baptism: Our Lord's Command.

"Ye leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the tradition of men.-- Mark 7:8.

"The authority of men, though learned and pious, is worthless, when set against the authority of God; and tradition, valuable in its own subordinate sphere, becomes unmixedly pernicious when employed to propound a doctrine, or establish an ordinance."--!. Stacey (Methodist).

All Christians deeply regret that the most sacred Bible themes should be matters of controversy, and that amongst believers in the Scriptures. The Divine Sonship of Jesus, the Holy Spirit, the Lord's Supper, Baptism--it is sad to think that these have been made the occasion of strife and bitterness. Our sorrow, however, will not relieve the situation, or prevent those who are not content with that which the Lord has revealed from teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men. The ordinance of Baptism particularly is now being made the subject of discussion. Many recently, having seen that the sprinkling of water upon the face of an unconscious infant has no divine authority, have accordingly as believers been buried with Christ in baptism. The building of a baptistery in St. Paul's Cathedral has attracted the attention of many to the New Testament ordinance. An evidence of the interest aroused is seen in the number of letters of enquiry which have been sent to the religious papers. Pedobaptists are having forced upon them the necessity of justifying their position. The success of the Scoville mission called forth many sermons intended to counteract the teaching and practice of the Churches of Christ. The Methodists especially have felt constrained to defend the practice of affusion, and of infant baptism. The Spectator, the Methodist organ, has labored zealously in the cause. Three little pamphlets on Should Only Believers be Baptized? Does Scripture Teach Immersion? and Is Baptism Necessary to Salvation?--all written by the same author and published by the Spectator Publishing Co.--are being widely circulated. The religious book depots stock and advertise a book by Mr. A. Madsen, Methodist minister, assistant editor of the Spectator, entitled, The Question of Baptism, a Handbook on Infant Baptism. This book goes out with the imprimatur of the Literature Committee of the Victoria and Tasmania Conference of the Methodist Church. This Committee--including E. H. Sugden, M.A., B.Sc., Master of Queen's College, W. Morley, D.D., W. Williams, D.D., and R. Ditterich, who is also editor of the Spectator--cordially recommend the manual "as a very important and weighty statement of our doctrinal position in relation to this Sacrament."

Members of Churches of Christ welcome the unusual interest being taken in the subject of baptism. We feel that while many will be content to read the tracts and books referred to and to accept without question the statements therein, a great number will go to the Word of God, as did the Bereans of old, to see whether these things are so. Therein we shall rejoice, for when a man is willing to accept the Scriptures as the sufficient guide to baptism, we know the inevitable result. When what we are assured is the teaching of God's Word is thus being written and spoken against, it is clearly right that we should examine the arguments being put forth. This we intend to do, giving special notice to the publications referred to, yet bringing other Pedobaptists statements

under review. If sprinkling is baptism, we wish to know it and to practice it. If it is not, we wish others to know it and so cease to leave the commandment of God for the traditions of men. It is but obeying the precept of God's Spirit to "put all things to the test" and "retain the good." As we proceed, we hope to speak the truth in love. We lament the lapse on the part of Mr. Kelly, the editor of the Presbyterian Messenger, in writing and publishing an undignified reference to certain unspecified "villainous proselytizers" who provide "a blend of spiritual conceit and bad manners sufficient to win for them the contempt of honest men." The baptismal controversy really cannot be settled by a scream! Such language hurts its user. A weak cause alone could need such weapons. One who has the truth of God can afford to be courteous. We do not need to impute motives in order to show that a doctrine is erroneous. We do not sanction error because we are polite. It was a Pedobaptists who said, "An endeavor to detect error and to establish truth is an act of friendship to every member of the body of Christ."

Why do we notice the matter at all? Partly, because silence would be taken as weakness. The reiteration of arguments, often answered though they have been, needs a new reply. Some people are being confirmed in their disobedience. Were baptism an unimportant thing, as trivial as some of our religious friends delight to declare it, we would not trouble to write. But that which Jesus did and commanded cannot be unimportant. Again, Christian union, for which all lovers of the Lord must work and pray, cannot come without agreement on the subject of baptism. "One baptism" appears in the Scriptures as one of the things included in "the unity of the Spirit" (Ephesians 4:3-6); and we can only get such unity when we agree to follow the plain teaching of the Word of God.

HOW MAY WE SETTLE THE QUESTION? No one knows one whit more of the Lord's will concerning baptism than what the Bible says. "To the law and to the testimony" (Isaiah 8:20) is still good advice. The Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation (2 Timothy 3:17). The Scripture was given "that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work" (2 Timothy 2:17). Did Paul speak the truth? Or do we need to take the word of men, wise theologians and teachers? Or, again, do we require to go to the post-apostolic age to see what the Lord would have us do? If the Scripture may furnish us "completely," then it is preposterous that we should go to the second and third centuries to learn the subjects of baptism. Yet this is what the Pedobaptists always does; he gets no reference to infant baptism till the later period, and then he reads into the apostolic age the results of his research. The Church of England and the Methodist Church state the Scripture's sufficiency in, these words: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." The Presbyterian Confession of Faith agrees with this, and says: "Unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men"; and again, "The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself." We cordially agree with these words, and therefore occupy our present position. Members of Churches of Christ are familiar with the watchword, "Nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the church, or be made a term of communion amongst Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament."

"Baptism," says the Westminster Confession of Faith, "is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ." Similarly, the Church of England and the Methodists teach that "there

are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord." If this be so, where shall we seek for instruction concerning baptism? Surely in the New Testament. As we proceed, we shall find that the leading arguments of Pedobaptists are drawn from the Old Testament, from extra-scriptural Judaistic practice, and from church usage in the centuries after the apostolic age. Strange that this should be necessary in the case of a New Testament ordinance "ordained of Christ"! The first mention of infant baptism is several generations too late to be "in the Gospel." Is it not significant that, while every minister who sprinkles water upon a baby claims to do it in the name of the Lord Jesus, he cannot get an instance of sprinkling as baptism in the Word of God? He uses the name of the Lord as authority for that which the Lord never asked. We have infants mentioned in the New Testament, and we have baptism often mentioned, but we never have the infants and the baptism mentioned together. We have no command and no example: yet men without a solitary word of sanction from Jesus Christ use his name as authority for an unscriptural ceremony. As we proceed, we shall see that advocates of infant baptism lay special stress on the fact that their practice is not specifically forbidden in the Word of God. Mr. Madsen, in many places (as in p. 14 of his book) makes this plea. In this introductory article, it will suffice to call attention to the extraordinary claim involved in this. Methodists say, and we all agree, that baptism was "ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel": now they ask us to give a passage which expressly forbids infant baptism. Does the Lord ordain all he does not forbid? Rather does he expect us with his positive institutions to do that which he ordained: "What thing soever I command you, that shall ye observe to do: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it" (Deuteronomy 12:32; Cf. Revelation 22:18-19). As soon as we learn to speak where the Bible speaks, infant baptism will disappear. Our Lord rebuked the Pharisees for making void the word of God by their traditions. One of the traditions was the washing before meals (see Mark 7:3-4). Regarding this, the Pharisees could truthfully say there was no command in the Scriptures which expressly forbade it. But they exalted a human ordinance and made it a religious practice; and for this Jesus rebuked them. Again, there is not on earth a Protestant who will consistently act on the principle that an express prohibition is needed in order to exclude a practice as an ordinance of the Lord. It is not expressly stated in Scripture that there is no such place as purgatory, that auricular confession is wrong, that extreme unction must not be practiced. Shall we say what is not forbidden is permitted? Rather will we take the view of the New Zealander of simple faith who met all the arguments of the Roman Catholics regarding worship of the Virgin and the saints, auricular confession, and so forth, with the one word: "It can't be right; for it is not in the Book." Infant baptism is not in the Book; and the attempt to get it in on the ground that it is not expressly forbidden will, if successful, bring in with it a host of practices which Protestants agree in rejecting.

Moreover, if we go to the post-apostolic age, when infant baptism is first mentioned, and seek to argue from this later practice to its primitive use, we get into similar trouble. We have either to say that the later practice does not prove an apostolic custom or to admit a host of things which Protestants reject as unscriptural. North Africa, so much appealed to regarding infant baptism, has also infant communion early in the third century. Again, "Tertullian speaks not only of baptism and the laying on of hands, but also mentions unction, the consignation or imposition of the sign of the cross, and lastly a mixture of milk and honey given the newly initiated to drink" (Duchesne). A great number of superstitious and unscriptural practices were in existence at the time when we get the first explicit mention of infant baptism. While, then, we may have to deal with the post-apostolic

age to a certain extent in following Pedobaptists arguments, that will not be because we attach great importance to the views of Cyprian or Tertullian. These were great men, but not inspired teachers. If there were unanimity in the Church Fathers--which there is not--on the subject of infant baptism, we should still demand that the practice be shown to be right from the Word of God. For us, that is the final court of appeal. And neither infant baptism nor sprinkling as baptism is found therein.

01.002. New Testament Example and Precept

New Testament Example and Precept.

"When they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women."-- Acts 8:12.

"It must be at once admitted that the New Testament contains no clear proof that infants were baptized in the days of the Apostles."--J. A. Beet, D.D. (Methodist, formerly Professor of Systematic Theology in the Richmond Theological College, England). In times such as the present, when advocates of infant baptism are bestirring themselves to defend their cause, this question must be in the minds of many, Why is their zealous and labored defense so necessary? We do not hear of numbers of people ceasing to believe in the validity of the immersion of believers as we do hear of defections from the ranks of those who believe in sprinkling water upon infants. Why do so many people leave their old position and as believers receive baptism? The answer is found in a significant difference in the authority for the respective positions. The advocate of believers' baptism has as his warrant the plain statement and example of the Lord and his apostles. The pleader for infant baptism has neither of these. See the difference in example. There are clear Bible instances of the baptism of believers. Three thousand who "gladly received the word" were baptized (Acts 2:11); the Samaritans, "when they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," "were baptized, both men and women" (Acts 8:12); the eunuch, instructed in the things of the Lord, was baptized (Acts 8:35-38); "many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized" (Acts 18:8). What about the Pedobaptists? They cannot produce a solitary text of Scripture which states the baptism of an infant. That is wily men leave their ranks and submit to that for which there is explicit warrant of God.

Look also at the difference in command. Is there a command for the baptism of a believer? Yes. Mr. Madsen challenges our right to use the commission in this connection--the commission in which the apostles were instructed to make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them (Matthew 28:19), in which it is said that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). So we do not press this now, but will examine it later. We have the following definite cases besides. People who were pricked in their heart, believing they had crucified the Messiah, were commanded to "repent and be baptized" (Acts 2:38). Gentiles on whom the Spirit had come, people speaking with tongues and magnifying God (who were therefore not unconscious infants) were "commanded" to be baptized (Acts 10:44-48). Saul, a penitent believer, was commanded, by a special messenger from God, "Arise and be baptized" (Acts 22:16). What of the Pedobaptists? If he will produce one such command regarding an infant, the controversy will end. But there is not one such command for this thing, said to be done in the name of the Lord. Many, accordingly, are ceasing to be Pedobaptists.

It is only fair to notice here that Mr. Madsen challenges our right to argue from the example of Cornelius and his company (Acts 10:1-48). He says: "But, if as the Baptists appear to contend by

citing the proof passage relating to Cornelius and Peter, only believers who have received the Holy Ghost are proper subjects of baptism, then the commission imposes an impossible obligation. To make such believers is beyond even the ability of apostles". (The Question of Baptism, p. 15; cf. p. 69). Regarding the reception by Cornelius and the others of the Holy Spirit before baptism, we are quite, content to take Mr. Madsen's words: "It is manifestly all exception, and was Divinely intended to surprise Peter, and change his mental attitude towards the Gentile world" (p. 69), or Dummelow's explanation--"a miraculous assurance that the Gentiles were not to be excluded from the gift of the Holy Spirit, but were to be baptized." But why, pray, may we not quote Acts 10:44-48 as a proof of the baptism of believers? It would be a little grotesque to quote it is a warrant for the baptism of infants who do not and cannot believe; for they are not "all here present in the sight of God, to hear all things that have been commanded" (Acts 10:33), nor do they "speak with tongues and magnify God" (Acts 10:46). Does our use of the instance make us "appear to contend" that "only believers who have received the Holy Ghost are proper subjects"? Mr. Madsen's own reference to "an exception" saves us from such appearance. Again, it is not only those who reject infant baptism who quote Acts 10:44-48 as a warrant for believers' baptism. Pedobaptists agree that the baptism of believers is right, and they often quote Acts 10:47 in proof. For instance, Bannerman in his Difficulties about Baptism, prepared at the request of the Publications Committee of the Free Church of Scotland,--a book to which Mr. Madsen refers and from which he quotes,--says:-- "Suppose a minister of our own Church, or of any other of the Churches which believe in Infant Baptism, in the position of Peter with Cornelius, or of Philip with the Eunuch, or of Paul with Lydia and the jailer of Philippi; he would act precisely in the same way as the apostles and the evangelist did. He would baptize each and all of these four persons as believers." So also T. Withrow, who was a Professor of Church History in Londonderry, in his Scriptural Baptism wrote: "Every instance recorded in Scripture of faith being required in order to baptism, is a case where we would require faith in order to baptism. The 3000 at Pentecost (Acts 2:40, Saul of Tarsus (Acts 9:18), and the disciples at Ephesus (Acts 19:5), were, up to that period, Jews, who, on entering into the Christian Church, were baptized, after making a profession of faith, but who would not have received the ordinance from us on any other terms. The same condition, previous to baptism, we would have demanded from the Eunuch (Acts 8:35), from Cornelius and his friends (Acts 10:47), and from Lydia (Acts 16:15). "Now, if it were right for these Pedobaptists controversialists to quote the case of Cornelius as a warrant for their occasional practice of baptizing believers, why should it be wrong for us? If their argument is not vitiated because they "appear to contend" that "only believers who have received the Holy Ghost are proper subjects for baptism," why should ours be? The above is but one instance of a fairly general contradiction in Pedobaptists arguments. We shall notice it chiefly when we deal with the Scriptures alleged to be in favor of infant baptism: "Almost every part of Holy Writ adduced by any Pedobaptist in favor of infant sprinkling is acknowledged by some Pedobaptist or other to contain no proof, no valid argument, in favor of the hypothesis." And so with their other lines of proof. When attacked from one quarter, we could move aside and confidently let another Pedobaptists meet and answer the former antagonist.

SOME STRIKING ADMISSIONS.

We have very many acknowledgements, on the part of believers in infant baptism, of the lack of Bible precedent or instruction. We give a few citations by way of example:

"The N.T. contains no explicit reference to the baptism of infants or young children."--C. Anderson Scott, in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.

"What is expressly commanded by Christ in regard to baptism is, that those who are made disciples by the preaching of the gospel should be baptized, i.e., those who had been heathens or unbelieving Jews, but had come to believe in Jesus. These only are referred to in Matthew 28:19; Mark 16:15-16; and in all the instances in which baptism is said to have been administered, it was to such persons."--James S. Candlish, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Free Church College, Glasgow, in *The Christian Sacraments*, in a paragraph headed "The express command insufficient."

"As baptism was closely united with a conscious entrance on Christian communion, faith and baptism were always connected with one another; and thus it is in the highest degree probable that baptism was performed only in instances where both could meet together, and that the practice of infant baptism was unknown at this period."--Neander, *History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles*.

"It is impossible to shake off the impression of the fact that the New Testament contains no direct reference, whether historical or doctrinal, to the practice of infant baptism."--J. C. Lambert, B.D., in *The Sacraments in the New Testament*.

"True, the New Testament contains no express command to baptize infants; such a Command would not agree with the free spirit of the gospel. Nor was there any compulsory or general infant baptism before the union of church and State."--P. Schaff, *Apostolic Christianity*.

Some one may say that these quotations do not carry us far, since there may be no command or example in the Scripture for infant baptism and yet the practice be necessarily inferred from the Scriptures. We therefore direct attention to the following admissions: "Not only is there no mention of the baptism of infants, but there is no text from which such baptism can be securely inferred."--A. Plummer, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham, in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I.

"It is probable that all that is said in Scripture about baptism refers to the baptism of adults."--Ibid.

"We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution, and the recognition of it which followed somewhat later, as an apostolical tradition, serves to confirm this hypothesis."--Neander's *Church History*.

"Baptism was originally, of course, in the name of Jesus, and it was only administered to adults; all that has been read into the Acts of the Apostles about the baptism of children is pure fancy."--Dr. Willibald Beyschlag, Professor of Theology at Halle, in *New Testament Theology; or Historical Account of the Teaching of Jesus and of Primitive Christianity according to the New Testament Sources*.

"In the Apostolic age, and in the three centuries which followed, it is evident that, as a general rule, those who came to baptism came in full age, of their own deliberate choice. We find a few cases of the baptism of children; in the third century we find one case of the baptism of infants."--Dean Stanley, *Christian Institutions*.

"Men are not born Christians, but made Christians. This remark of Tertullian may have applied to the large majority even after the middle of the second century, but thereafter a companion feature arose in the shape of the natural extension of Christianity through parents to the children. Subsequently to that period the practice of infant baptism was also inaugurated; at least we are unable to get certain evidence for it at an earlier date." In a footnote is added: "Here, too, I am convinced that the saying holds true, *Ab initio sic non erat*" (from the beginning it was not so).--Adolf Harnack, Professor of Church History in the University of Berlin, in *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*.

"There is not one word in the New Testament which even suggests in the slightest degree that spiritual blessings are, or may be, conveyed to an infant by a rite of which he is utterly unconscious. And the suggestion contradicts the broad principles underlying the kingdom of God."--J. Agar Beet in *A Treatise on Christian Baptism* (see also above).

We do not quote these men as if the matter can be settled by mere human testimony. Nor do we suggest that they are of the opinion that the practice of infant baptism is out of harmony with the principles of the New Testament. The concessions are all the more remarkable because they come from believers in infant baptism. This has to be borne in mind, and may keep some from being misled by the facetious irony of Mr. Madsen when he says: "The wonder is that the practice survives, when, as announced by the Baptists, the weight of scholarship repudiates it" (*The Question of Baptism*, p. 84). We unhesitatingly say that the weight of scholarship is against the view that sprinkling of water upon infants is baptism as warranted by New Testament command or example. The reason why "the practice survives" is that men are not content with that for which there is express warrant; they agree that believers' baptism and immersion are warranted, but think that something else will do as well. We have a wholesome respect for scholarship, ancient or modern. We find, however, that what a man will say as a scholar and historian is one thing; what he will say as a theologian, and especially as a controversialist in extremis, is often quite a different thing. We wish modern practice to harmonize more with modern scholarship.

SCHOLARLY AUTHORITIES.

Under this heading, the author of *The Question of Baptism* seeks, by citation from men of undoubted scholarship, to answer those who "are never tired of objecting that infant baptism is not only repugnant to the sense of Scripture, but that it is opposed by modern scholarship." We have already quoted from a number of believers in infant baptism who admit that the practice is not inferable from Scripture. We may now notice three of Mr. Madsen's "scholarly authorities." Here is a paragraph from page 85 of *The Question of Baptism*:

"Three scholars may be cited who certify on historic grounds to the propriety of infant baptism. (1) Prof. Gwatkin affirms: 'As regards infant baptism, there can be little doubt that it dates back to the Apostolic age.' In thorough accord with Dorner, it is maintained, 'the principle of infant baptism (is) that even the infant of an hour belongs to Christ' (*Early Church History*). (2) Prof. McGiffert lays it down as indisputable that the practice of baptizing infants was a 'common' one before the end of the second century' (*History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*.) (3) Dr. Kurtz, reviewing the historical position, asserts that infant baptism was 'universally held to be proper. Tertullian alone opposed it.' (*Church History*, Vol. IV.)"

We strongly recommend as many as possible to go to the public libraries and refer to the books whence these quotations are taken. If they will do so, they will learn of the straits to which the latest apologist for infant baptism is reduced, and also, incidentally, they will be led to ponder on the ethics of quotation. The paragraph quoted above must have been written in the fond belief that few or none would take the trouble to look up the references.

H. M. Gwatkin, Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge, in his *Early Church History to A.D. 313*, 1909, Vol. I, on the same page in which he says that "there can be little doubt that it dates back to the apostolic age," continues: "On the other hand, we have decisive evidence that infant baptism is no direct institution either of the Lord himself or of his apostles. There is no trace of it in the New Testament. Every discussion of the subject presumes persons old enough to have faith and repentance, and no case of baptism is recorded except of such persons" (pp. 249, 250). In the light of this, what becomes of the fairness of the use to which Gwatkin's name is put in the paragraph in question?

Notice again the context in which Gwatkin refers to "the infant of an hour." He says:

"Even in the fourth century some of the best women of the time, like Anthusa and Monnica, did not feel bound to baptize their children in infancy; and a writer of no less unquestioned orthodoxy than Gregory of Nazianzus advises that it be put off till the child 'can frame to speak the mystical words.' This is every way illogical, but at all events it gives up the principle of Infant Baptism, that even the infant of an hour belongs to Christ" (p. 250). The intelligent reader need only be asked to compare this with Mr. Madsen's alleged quotation.

A. C. McGiffert, Professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary, New York, is similarly treated in the paragraph in question. Since McGiffert wrote *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, would it not be well to quote what he says regarding the apostolic age? After all, we are more interested in the first century than we are in the second. McGiffert on the apostolic age was not quoted because he did not there support the Pedobaptists position. Read Madsen on McGiffert, in paragraph quoted above, then read McGiffert, who writes: "Whether infants were baptized in the apostolic age, we have no means of determining. Where the original idea of baptism as a baptism of repentance, or where Paul's profound conception of it as a symbol of the death and resurrection of the believer with Christ prevailed, the practice would not be likely to arise. But where the rite was regarded as a mere sign of one's reception into the Christian circle, it would be possible for the custom to grow up under the influence of the ancient idea of the family as a unit in religion as well as in other matters. Before the end of the second century, at any rate, the custom was common ' but it did not become universal until a much later time" (p. 543).

Prof. McGiffert, it will be seen, holds that infant baptism would not be likely to grow up where Paul's doctrine was accepted. Infant baptism, then, must have become more "common" as the apostolic doctrine was departed from. The statements in Kurtz's *Church History* have also suffered at the hands of our author, who quotes but a part of a sentence, and who fails to inform us as to the period in which and the people by whom Kurtz says infant baptism was "universally held to be proper." As a fact, that period was the post-apostolic age. In that part of his history which deals with the "primitive church," Kurtz says: "Equally impossible is it strictly to demonstrate that infant baptism had been practiced by the apostles, although this is probable (Acts 2:39; Acts 16:33; 1 Corinthians 7:14)."

There is no universally proper custom suggested here. Of the following period, Kurtz writes: "The Fathers generally connected baptism and regeneration. Hence, in theory, the baptism of infants was generally recognized, although it was not universally introduced. Tertullian 'alone decidedly opposed it" (T. & T. Clark's Edition, Vol. L, pp. 118, 119).

Controversialists, it will be perceived, will do strange things with their authorities. Scripture and human testimony alike need to be strained to get apparent warrant for the Pedobaptists practice.

01.003. The Commission

The Commission.

"Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you."-- Matthew 28:19-20.

"Teach, matheeteusate, make disciples of all the nations, bring them to an acquaintance with God who bought them, and then baptize them in the name of the Father."--DR. Adam Clarke, Methodist.

"The rite thus termed presupposes a good deal that is not always expressed. "(a) The person baptized has repented of his sins, and baptism implies the consequent forgiveness of them (Acts 2:38). "(b) Baptism also implies belief in Christ. The person baptized expressed this belief, and was regarded after baptism as a disciple of Christ."--W. C. Allen, in International Critical Commentary on Matthew.

We have already seen that Pedobaptists are not agreed as to the Scriptural warrant for their position. Some of them--as J. A. Beet, Methodist, and A. Plummer, Anglican--cheerfully allow that there is no text from which it may be clearly inferred that the practice was apostolic. Others, however, believe that there is a valid argument by way of inference. We shall, therefore, examine some of their proof texts, beginning with our Lord's commission. The tract on Should Only Believers be Baptized? published by the Spectator Publishing Co., and now being circulated by Methodists, has this extraordinary pronouncement on Matthew 28:19 : "A 'disciple,' according to this verse, is a baptized person. 'Make disciples, baptizing them.' In other words, by baptism claim them for Christ that they may be taught all things whatsoever He had commanded. That is the very thing we do in infant baptism. The Apostles were to disciple, or baptize, all the nations. Surely 'the nations' includes children! Nothing in the text excludes them." This is in harmony with the greater part of what is said in Mr. Madsen's chapter significantly entitled "The Baptizing Commission." So the Methodist Church in Victoria and Tasmania through its Literature Committee seems to vouch for such an interpretation as is given above. The first thought that comes to us is that Pedobaptists do not act on the above. They are not wont to baptize infants because they are infants, part of the "all nations." There has been many a pretty difference amongst advocates of infant baptism as to what infants are to be baptized. Avoiding minor differences, we note that the following questions have been raised: Must both parents be members of the visible church? or, will one Christian parent suffice? Must the parents be communicants? Or, are all infants without exception eligible? The Westminster Confession of Faith says that "the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized." The practice is generally limited to cases in which the infants are children of believers. A missionary who went to a place and caught and baptized the children of unbelievers would, we are constrained to believe, receive a well-deserved reprimand from his Pedobaptists official board. If this is so, then infants are not baptized because as infants they are included in the "all nations" of the commission.

Again, the argument that infants may be baptized because they are in the nations would prove altogether too much for the Pedobaptists. Idiots, deists, atheists, drunkards, are as truly part of the nations as the infants are. Our friends repudiate with horror the thought of baptizing these on the ground of their being in the nations. Here are two syllogisms, one of which is as valid as the other: (1) All nations are to be baptized (i.e., discipled; so Methodist tract says); infants are in the nations; therefore infants are to be baptized. (2) All nations are to be baptized (i.e., discipled); idiots and drunkards are in the nations; therefore idiots and drunkards are to be baptized. If the one argument is false, as all our friends agree, so is the other. If one objects that persons who are idiots or drunkards are folk on whom it would "obviously be a scandal to confer baptism," we answer that this very objection itself shows that being in the nations is not the ground of baptism. There must be some additional ground. Infants are not baptized because they are in the nations. Baptism alone will not disciple. It is absolutely essential to Mr. Madsen's argument that "discipleship" be shown not to involve any belief or instruction. Otherwise, it is evident that it would be ludicrous to suggest that infants may be discipled by baptizing. We shall examine, therefore, the amusingly futile attempt to dissociate discipleship from instruction and belief. In doing so, we deem it fair to state that the following argument has not cogency against all Pedobaptists; for, as a fact, as we shall abundantly prove, many of them, including some of the best Methodist scholars and divines, reject entirely Mr. Madsen's interpretation. On page 18 of *The Question of Baptism* are "three facts to which attention is directed": "(i) There were persons who 'believed' on Christ, who never received any teaching whatever, and had never even seen the Saviour. An instance of this is--the Samaritans who believed on the testimony of the woman who had had five husbands, as recorded in John 4:39."

I assure the reader of this that a Methodist preacher in Victoria published these sentences as a "fact." Apparently, he did not do it as a joke. We may remark that we do not see that it was a marvelous thing that they who "had never even seen the Saviour" yet believed, seeing that possibly a few hundred million folk on earth today are in that case. But the Samaritan men believed without "any teaching whatever!" And Mr. Madsen is penning this as a means of proving that " 'teaching,' or preaching, was not even necessary to induce people to believe," and this in order to help his case in making disciples by baptism of infants who cannot believe! If Pedobaptists will give all persons before baptism as much- teaching or preaching as the Samaritans got and with as happy an issue, the present controversy will cease. John says, "Many of the Samaritans believed on him because of the word of the woman, who testified, He told me all things that ever I did" (John 4:39). The second of "the three facts" is stated thus: "(2) Our Lord had 'disciples' who, though receiving instruction, were not 'believers.' This appears in the reference to the people who went back and walked no more with Him, as related in John 6:66."

Accordingly, it is held "that 'to disciple,' it was not necessary to make persons 'believers.' " One question will suffice: Did the folk who disbelieved and went back and walked no more with Jesus continue to be regarded as disciples? If Mr. Madsen's argument is to stand, he must answer--Yes. We would like a proof from John 6:1-71. "(3) Many 'believed' in Christ who were not 'disciples.' For example, the Jews who witnessed the raising of Lazarus from the dead (John 11:45)--and those who would not confess Christ lest they should be put out of the synagogue (John 12:42)."

We may express cordial agreement with the fact that not all believers are disciples. This fact, however, does not begin to suggest that one can be a disciple without being a believer. If one asks

how one can be a believer without being a disciple, we can ask Mr. Madsen to answer: "It is manifest that in the New Testament 'to disciple' means to bring into Christ's school--the Church--those who are willing to be taught, how to become Christians, the initiatory sign of discipleship being baptism" (p. 16). A believer who would not confess Jesus (as in John 12:42) was manifestly not willing to come into Christ's school. It is curious that Mr. Madsen did not see that in the quotation just made he is answering his own statement that Methodists disciple the infants by baptizing them; for infants have no will to come into Christ's school, or to be taught. He answers also the words of the Methodist tract, "to disciple, or baptize," which seem to identify the two things. "To baptize" can hardly be "to disciple" if baptism is simply the initiatory sign of discipleship.

Pedobaptist controversialists sometimes make great capital out of the fact that in the commission "teaching" is mentioned after "baptizing." We cordially agree that the New Testament does not contemplate anything like probation or the catechumenate of the later centuries. But we wholly dissent from Mr. Madsen's claim that, since "teaching" follows baptism, therefore discipleship need not involve previous instruction or present teaching of any kind.

Already we have seen how ludicrous are the attempts to dissociate instruction, belief and discipleship, based on John 4:39; John 6:66; John 12:42. There is instruction needed to make a disciple, and the baptized disciple then needs to be taught to observe all that the Lord commanded.' In his zeal against Dr. Carson, the well-known Baptist writer, Mr. Madsen endeavors to show that Alexander Campbell contradicted Carson's view that the commission itself limited the subjects of baptism to believers. With us, neither Campbell nor Carson is authoritative. The one man might contradict the other as often as Methodist expositors contradict Mr. Madsen, and yet it would be true that no one could get authority for infant baptism in Matthew 28:19. We are interested, however, in accuracy and fairness of representation, and so beg to point out that Alexander Campbell's position is not that which the person who only read *The Question of Baptism* would necessarily believe it to be. Mr. Madsen quotes A. Campbell as follows:--"Does not the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, express the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed? Cleanse the room, washing it; clear the floor, sweeping it; .. Convert the nations, baptizing them, are exactly the same forms of speech. No person, I presume, will controvert this. If so, then no man could be called a disciple or convert. .. until he was immersed" (p. 20).

Now, while A. Campbell (who, by the way, was not the "Founder of the Disciples," as Mr. Madsen declares) wrote that one could not be called a disciple unless he was baptized, he did not agree with the view of Mr. Madsen, that baptism apart from previous belief could make a disciple of anybody. He held that the word "disciple" itself carried with it the idea of previous instruction. He said: "We have two words of very different meaning, occurring in the same verse, translated by one and the same word, teach. These are *matheteuoo* and *didascoo*. They are visibly and audibly different words. They are not composed of the same characters, nor of the same sounds. They are just as different in sense. They both, indeed, mean to impart instruction; but it is a different kind of instruction. The first indicates that instruction necessary to make a disciple: the second imparts that species of instruction afterwards given to one who has become a disciple with regard to his duties" (*Christian Baptism* pp. 220, 221).

Again Campbell wrote: "A disciple, then, according to the commission, is one that has heard the gospel, believed it, and been immersed" ("Christian System," p. 198). Thus Alexander Campbell repudiated the notion that baptism alone could disciple. We could scarcely expect, however, that his position would receive better treatment in *The Question of Baptism* than that awarded to "scholarly authorities" among Pedobaptists.

It is possible that an attempted answer to the foregoing may be made, as follows: A. Campbell was forced to admit that the participle "baptizing" after the imperative "disciple" declared the manner in which the imperative should be obeyed; and that is enough to support the claim in *The Question of Baptism*. The other statement of Campbell, that "disciple" involves previous instruction may be said to be an unsupported statement of his, made in order to bolster up his belief in believers' baptism. We therefore, in reply, point out that there are candid and scholarly Pedobaptists who, while they tenaciously believe that baptizing is the method of making disciples, also declare that previous instruction or belief is implied in the command to disciple.

Prof. H. B. Swete, writing on the commission in *The Expositor*, takes this view. He says: "The church is bidden not only to baptize those whom she discipled, but to instruct the baptized. Evangelistic work is implied in *matheeteusate*."

E. E. Anderson, M.A., in his recent *Commentary on Matthew*, explicitly states that baptism "is not spoken of as a rite which followed the being made a disciple," yet acknowledges the antecedent belief in discipleship. He says: "Christian baptism, requiring as its condition repentance, and implying faith in Christ, and symbolizing the forgiveness of sins through Christ, was the rite by which one became a disciple and entered the Christian Society."

S. Cheetham, in his well-known *Church History*, writes: "From the earliest times a profession of faith was required of him who would be baptized. When the Lord charged his apostles to admit men to discipleship by baptism into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, it is clear that he required faith in the Holy Trinity as a condition. A man must 'confess the good confession' in order to receive baptism." The name of Olshausen is referred to in *The Question of Baptism* as against the restriction of the commission to the baptism of believers. It was worse than rash to use Olshausen's name, as the following quotation shows:

"That some have altogether misunderstood this passage (as we have already intimated) is manifest from their interpreting the *matheeteusate* as something which should precede baptism, just as if the meaning of the words had been, 'first instruct, then baptize them.' But the grammatical construction does not warrant such a mode of interpretation; for the two participles *baptizontes* and *didaskontes* are precisely what constitute the *matheeteuein*. And again, that view is contradicted by the apostolic practice, according to which instruction never preceded baptism. On the contrary, baptism followed upon the mere confession that Jesus was the Christ. But when, through baptism, the believer had become a member of the community of the saints. then, as such, he participated in the progressive courses of instruction which prevailed in the church."—Olshausen on *Matthew 28:19*.

Meyer, the great German exegete, is as definite as any that the baptizing is something in which the discipleship is to be consummated, not something that must be done after making disciples; but he does not believe that therefore there is no present teaching or belief involved. He says on

the "teaching them" that since it is not said baptizing and teaching, therefore the word "teaching" is not co-ordinate with but subordinate to "baptizing," "intimating that a certain ethical teaching must necessarily accompany in every case the administration of baptism: while ye teach them to observe everything, etc. This moral instruction must not be omitted when you baptize, but it must be regarded as an essential part of the ordinance. That being the case, infant baptism cannot possibly have been contemplated" in "baptizing," nor, of course, in "all the nations" either. As before, we have here allowed Pedobaptists to answer Pedobaptists. On the general question of the bearing of the commission on the question of infant baptism, we may say that many scholarly advocates of infant baptism deny absolutely that the commission will furnish the requisite authority for it. We give a few quotations, the first two being from well-known Methodist writers:

Richard Watson, in his *Theological Institutes*, refers to the commission as showing the form of words used in baptism the authority conveyed, and third, by "the faith required of the person baptized,--faith in the existence of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost." He says that "in the primitive church, men were not baptized in order to their being taught, but taught in order to their being baptized." "The A.V. has the right meaning in 'teach.' It was through the instruction (13:52) which prepared for baptism that baptism itself came to be called 'illumination.'" --Prof. W. F. Slater, of Didsbury College, Matthew 28:19 in *The Century Bible*.

"Baptizing them--Christ enjoins that those who have submitted to the gospel, and professed to be his disciples, shall be baptized; partly that their baptism may be a pledge of eternal life before God, and partly that it may be an outward sign of faith before men.--JOHN Calvin.

"'Make disciples of all the nations' (Matthew 28:19), implies those who are old enough to receive instruction."--A. Plummer, in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*. "What is expressly commanded by Christ in regard to baptism is, that those who are made disciples by the preaching of the gospel should be baptized, i.e., those who had been heathens or unbelieving Jews, but had come to believe in Jesus. These only are referred to in Matthew 28:19; Mark 16:15-16."--Prof. Candlish, Presbyterian, whose book was recently recommended by Mr. Kelly in the *Presbyterian Messenger*.

Apart from the views and comments of men, we may see from the New Testament itself what the verb *matheeteuo* means. The Westminster Confession of Faith admirably says that "the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself." The verb translated in R.V. of Matthew 28:19 by "make disciples of" is found besides in the following places, and in these alone, in the New Testament: Matthew 13:52; Matthew 27:57; Acts 14:21. The first says: "Every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old," That there are knowledge and belief here is obvious. In the second passage, Joseph of Arimathia is said to have been Jesus' disciple. This man is thus described: "A good man and a righteous. .. who was looking for the kingdom of God" (Luke 22:50-51); so he could hardly have been as uninstructed as the infants, which Mr. Madsen thinks he disciples by baptizing! In Acts 14:21 Luke says, "When they had preached the gospel to that city, and had made many disciples," Paul and Barnabas returned. Here was preaching preliminary to discipleship. That is, in every other case in which the verb *matheeteuo* is used in the New Testament there is previous instruction. The attempt, then, to eliminate it in Matthew 28:19 must fail miserably.- The writer of *The Question of Baptism*, after claiming that the commission gives warrant not only for the baptism of believers, but also for their infant children,

declares, "We have to study the religious history, training, and acts of the Apostles, to discover what the commission meant, and how it was interpreted" (p. 21). If this is so, then infants are not directly warranted by the commission. If infant baptism were preached from the beginning by virtue of the presence of infants in "the nations," why have we in the history of the "acts of the Apostles"--held by Mr. Madsen necessary to the interpretation of the commission--no mention of the act of baptizing an infant? We have mention of the baptism of believers, men and women. The inferential argument from Acts 2:39 and other Scriptures we shall notice later.

It is interesting to see the anxiety which Pedobaptists writers manifest to throw the onus of proof on those who practice believers' baptism. When we ask for a definite Scripture warrant for their practice, they seek to turn the tables by asking us to produce a passage which expressly excludes infants. Over and over again, in *The Question of Baptism* such an attempt is made. The chapter on "The Baptising Commission" has it: The commission does not directly exclude infants; therefore, it is held, infants are Scriptural subjects of baptism. The disciples, it is declared, could not exclude them without an explicit command so to do. Such a claim is, as was mentioned in our first article, utterly wrong. We seek to do what the Lord warrants, not to do everything that he has not expressly prohibited. We may here add that the disciples learned to take this view of the word. John says a man must not go onward, take the lead, or transgress the teaching of Christ, he must abide in it (2 John 1:9). So we gather that the commission authorizes what it includes; it does not authorize all it does not explicitly exclude. The only hope of getting infant baptism in the Bible is to argue that the Lord did not say: Thou shalt not baptize infants! But neither did he say: Thou shalt not baptize unbelievers. He did authorize preaching and baptism of those who accepted the gospel message; and in doing these things we know we are abiding in his teaching.

One of the chief objections to Mr. Madsen's treatment of the commission is that it makes too much of baptism. Baptism, as ordained by our Lord, must be a good thing. God has attached special promises to it. But the Bible never suggests that the application of water, however performed, can make anyone a disciple. An infant cannot believe, cannot repent, cannot confess Christ; but it cannot object to having some water sprinkled on it; and the last-named act, according to Mr. Madsen, makes him a disciple who was not a disciple before! Jesus says: "Whosoever doth not bear his own cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple" (Luke 14:27). Madsen says: "We disciple the infants by baptizing them." With all due respect to the author of *The Question of Baptism*, we prefer the statement of the Lord Jesus.

We have dealt at some length with the commission, because our opponents refer to it as "the strategic passage upon the question in Scripture," and as "our authority for administering baptism." From our study we see that in consistency we must either say that the commission warrants our baptizing anybody at all who is in "the nations" (and our Methodist friends will not say this), or we must hold that there is no warrant for the baptism of infants and others who are uninstructed and non-believing.

01.004. The Argument from Circumcision

The Argument from Circumcision.

"He that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every male throughout your generations, he that is born in the house or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed."-- Genesis 17:12.

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers . . . In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old."-- Hebrews 8:8-9; Hebrews 8:13.

"When they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women."-- Acts 8:12.

Advocates of infant baptism ever claim that the apostles had to interpret the command to baptize in the light of their previous knowledge of Jewish practice. Hence the appeal to the Old Testament. Now, it might reasonably be urged that the apostles had a nearer and more direct example than anything found in the Old Testament Scriptures. Mr. Tait, Presbyterian minister, in his booklet on Christian Baptism, says: "The disciples would understand Christ's command in the light of what they knew of John's baptism." If this were so, they would know that the people baptized by John confessed their sin (Matthew 2:1-6), and that repentance was so much the condition of John's baptism that it was called "the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins" (Mark 1:4). We get a striking parallel with this in the very first occasion on which the apostles acted on the instructions of the commission; Peter told heart-pierced enquirers: "Repent and be baptized" (Acts 2:38). Our friends, however, invariably get to the Old Testament, and find the strongest support of their position in infant circumcision. Herein is a marvelous thing. Baptism "was instituted by Christ," as Mr. Tait says. It is, according to the Westminster Confession, "a sacrament of the New Testament." Yet Pedobaptists go to the Old Testament to learn the subjects of what is a New Testament rite. They cannot get infants in connection with baptism in the New; nor can they get baptism in conjunction with infants in the Old: but they do get infants in the Old and baptism in the New, and then try desperately hard to show that the Bible "identifies circumcision with baptism" (as Mr. Madsen says), or, as the more common statement is, that baptism came in the room of circumcision. He who wants authority for circumcision of male infants naturally goes to the account of the institution of circumcision, and there he gets it (Genesis 17:12). He who wishes authority for the baptism of infants cannot get that anywhere in the Bible. There is a significant difference here. Mr. Madsen tries to forestall such a criticism as the foregoing by saying:

"Any objection raised by Baptists against our appeal to Old Testament usage for light upon the meaning of Christian baptism re-acts upon their own method of argument, inasmuch as they appeal to the Old Testament, and the classics, for light and authority to justify their mode of baptism by immersion" (pp. 84, 85). When we quote the Old Testament on the action of baptism, it is because the very word "baptize" whose meaning we seek to know, and cognate words, are

found there (in the Septuagint version). When a man goes to the Old Testament for infant baptism, he does not find any infant baptism there: the words and the idea are alike absent. He gets in the Old Testament minute instructions regarding a different rite, and then wrests such in order to support a practice which has not a tittle of Scriptural authority either in Old Testament or New. Should a twentieth century Disraeli arise to write another book on Curiosities of Literature, he may find some instances in Pedobaptists apologies for their practice. I have some gems, two of which on our present theme I would like others to enjoy with me. In *Infant Baptism in the Bible*, James Pollock, M.A., writes:

"Jesus plainly shows us that we must search the Old Testament Scriptures about infant baptism. 'When the chief priests and scribes saw the children crying in the Temple, and were 'sore displeased,' Jesus said, 'Yea, have ye never read, Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast Thou perfected praise?' Matthew 21:15-16. Compare with this our Lord's words to Nicodemus, 'Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?' John 3:10. In the former place our Blessed Lord speaks of children, in the latter of the new birth 'of water and of the Spirit:' in the former He applies to the children that followed Him an Old Testament saying about 'babes and sucklings;' in the latter, He takes it for granted that a 'master of Israel' ought to be able to see the meaning of the doctrine of Christian Baptism: Do you see the need of Infant Baptism? Have you 'never read' your Bible?" In reply, suffice it to say that no one denies that you can get "babes and sucklings" in one place and baptism in another; but the infant texts are not the baptism texts, or vice versa. Mr. Pollock's contribution to the exegesis of John 3 merits notoriety, if only as a means of adding to the gaiety of nations. In the Methodist tract, *Should Only Believers be Baptized?* appears the following sentence, which lets us know of the haste which must have been manifested in preparing literature to stay the exodus from the Pedobaptists ranks:

"Ask any reasonable Jew why his child should not be baptized under the New Testament as well as circumcised under the Old, and what could he answer but, 'Yes'?"

We have always thought that this is the situation, but we hardly expected a Victorian Methodist Publishing Co. to so candidly confess it. If it really be so, it only shows that that Jew is as deficient in Scriptural reasons as are our Methodist friends. If one ask us why a believer in Christ should be baptized, we point him to the command (Acts 2:38; Acts 22:16) and to the example (Acts 8:12; Acts 18:8). If believers in infant baptism when asked "Why?" can only answer "Yes," they really must forgive us for suggesting that their reason is not very cogent.

THE PEDOBAPTIST ARGUMENT STATED. The argument is that in "the Jewish Church," or "Old Testament Church," infants were found. There is church continuity or identity. Baptism has taken the place of circumcision. Seeing that there is no express command to exclude infants, the apostles must have understood that such are to be included in the church, and that consequently they are fit subjects of baptism. We give three statements from Pedobaptists controversialists:

Mr. Madsen, in *The Question of Baptism*, writes:

"God had a Church in the Old Testament, and gave directions as to the persons who should be admitted to its membership, and the method of admitting them" (p. 22). "It would appear to the mind of St. Paul that the circumcision of the Old Testament passes into the baptism of the New, just as, similarly, the Passover passes into the Lord's Supper," etc. (p. 23). "Old Testament

circumcision" "was the Sacrament of admission into the membership of the Church of God before the coming of Christ" (p. 23). "One of our arguments for the practice is that God, having granted privileges to infants in the Old Testament, such as Church membership on receiving the sign and seal of it, is not likely to withdraw similar privileges from infants in the New Testament. If there has been a reversal of the Divine complacency, where is the evidence of it? We baptize infants on the basis that God has not changed His mind regarding their admission into His Church" (p. 84).

Bannerman, in *Difficulties About Baptism*, writes:

"The Church of God has been essentially one from the beginning" (p. 63). "The infant children of believers were members of the Church, it is admitted, from the days of Abraham to the days of Christ. When were they put out of their privileges as such, and why?" (p. 65). "The only change is that Baptism has taken the place of circumcision--being, as the Apostle of the Gentiles calls it, 'the circumcision of Christ;' just as the Lord's Supper has taken the place of the Passover," etc. (p. 65).

T. Withrow, in *Scriptural Baptism*, uses similar language:

"The Church, into whose membership infants were introduced by an express appointment of God, is the same in all essential particulars with the Church that now exists" (p. 42). "To produce from the New Testament any express statute re-affirming the membership of infants in the Church, is what we are not bound to do. Except the Old Testament is a dead letter-- a bundle of waste paper--there is no need for it" (p. 45).

REPLY.

Before examining in detail the argument stated above, we may mention that Pedobaptists do not agree among themselves on this question. Just as we find some who seek to justify infant baptism on the ground that infants are in the church, while others (as Mr. Madsen) say that infants are brought into the church by baptism, so in the case of infant circumcision: some declare it to be an initiatory rite, while others declare it was received by those who were in "the Jewish Church" and covenant. They cannot all be right.

We have before referred to the case with which Pedobaptists' arguments can be answered by Pedobaptists. We find a good illustration of this in the circumcision argument. After reading what Messrs. Madsen, Bannerman and Withrow say, consider the following from the pen of an able and learned believer in infant baptism. The quotation is long, but interesting:

"Very frequently we hear an argument like the following, in support of the view that infant baptism was the regular practice from the earliest days of the Church. The members of the Jewish Church, it is said, had been accustomed to circumcise their children; and so the baptism of children would be regarded by the first Christians as a matter of course and a matter of right. Any seeming exclusion of infants from the blessings of the covenant, in which they had fully shared under the former economy, would inevitably have created such a disturbance as would have left some traces upon the early history of the Church. It might just as well be argued that because at the Jewish Passover young children were present as partakers of the feast, therefore the first Christians, as a matter of course and a matter of right, would bring their little children to the Lord's table. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that circumcision was a rite which applied not to all children, but only to male children. The circumcision of a male child, therefore, could not immediately and as matter of

course become the ground of a claim that children of both sexes should be baptized. And if it was the case under the Jewish dispensation that a girl or a woman enjoyed the privileges of the covenant by her very birth as a Jewess, coupled with her relation to the head of the family, is there any reason to doubt that Jewish Christians would have no great difficulty in accepting the baptism of parents as carrying with it a present share for their young children in the privileges of the Christian community? Besides, it must always be remembered that the Christianity which meets us in the New Testament is not in the main a Jewish Christianity at all, but a Gentile Christianity. The analogy of Jewish circumcision would not naturally suggest itself to Paul's Gentile converts as a reason for seeking baptism on behalf of their children. And Paul himself, who first worked out the relation between the two dispensations, and pointed to a certain correspondence between baptism and circumcision, does not give any evidence of having pressed upon his Gentile converts the duty of having their infant children baptized."--J. C. Lambert, B.D. in Kerr Lectures, The Sacraments in the New Testament, 1903, pp. 202-204.

We could afford to wait until our opponents answer their Pedobaptists brother; but, since the circumcision argument is the strongest one that can be presented in favor of infant baptism, we shall risk the charge of doing a superfluous thing and give an independent reply to the views now being disseminated. The validity of the argument drawn from infant circumcision as stated by Mr. Madsen depends upon three things, not one of which is true:

That there is Church identity or continuity in the Old and New Testaments.

That circumcision admitted Jewish infants into "the Church of God" or "the Jewish Church."

That baptism has taken the place of circumcision.

CHURCH CONTINUITY.

Mr. Bannerman expressly says: "The Church of God has been essentially one from the beginning." Such a belief is necessary to Mr. Madsen's argument also, for it obviously would avail nothing to prove that infants were members of another "church" and proceed to argue that therefore they were in the church which is "the body of Christ." If "the church" be not identical, there is no point in Mr. Madsen's talk about God not having changed His mind regarding admission into His church.

We note the unscriptural phraseology which Mr. Madsen and others are forced to use in order to give their argument even the appearance of cogency. They talk of "the Jewish Church," "the Old Testament Church," but such expressions are foreign to the Bible. The term "the church of God"--applied in The Question of Baptism to an Old Testament people--is never so used in the Bible. God and His people called it a nation (see Exodus 32:10; Exodus 33:13; Haggai 2:14; Malachi 3:9; Acts 10:22; Acts 26:4; etc.). Pedobaptist writers call it "the Jewish Church" because to say that the Jewish nation and the church which Jesus loved and for which He gave himself are identical is "rather too gross a form of speech for Christian ears." In Acts 7:38 we have the phrase "Church in the wilderness" (R.V. marginal reading, "congregation"). J. Vernon Bartlett, Prof, of Church History in Mansfield College, Oxford (a Pedobaptists), in his commentary on Acts, writes: "The better rendering is 'assembly,' as in Deuteronomy 9:10; Deuteronomy 18:16; for it is a particular gathering in the wilderness of Sinai that is in question, and not the corporate being of Israel throughout their wanderings."

We have divine warrant for saying that, whether God's people of old were or were not a "church," the church of Jesus Christ was not in existence for centuries after Abraham's children had been what Mr. Madsen calls admitted into the church by circumcision. In Matthew 16:18 we have the Saviour's words to Peter, "Upon this rock I will build my church." "I will build" settles for ever the question of church continuity or identity in Old and New Testaments. Dummelow's Commentary well says: "The whole text speaks of the future. Christ says not 'I build,' but 'I will build'; not 'I give,' but 'I will give,' referring to the future for the explanation." It is folly to argue that because infants are included in the Abrahamic covenant therefore they are to be found in the church which was not established till nineteen hundred years after the days of Abraham.

The Jewish nation, or "the Jewish Church," is not the church of Christ, for the former was "national, temporal, and fleshly: the other for all nations, eternal and spiritual." In order to admission into the Jewish community, "no intellectual, moral, or spiritual qualification was required of any man." Abraham's descendants were in "the Jewish Church" by generation; only twice-born persons are in the church of the living God.

The futility of going back to the Old Testament is apparent when we remember that the Old Covenant has passed away (Hebrews 8:7-13). Should one dare to say that the conditions of admission must be the same in the New as in the Old, the inspired writer will give a sufficient reply: "The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law"(Hebrews 7:12). We do not say God has "changed His mind"; we do not dream of saying the Old Testament is "a bundle of waste paper";--we simply believe God when He says there is a change of the law. No one, apostle or other, ever excluded infants from the church of Jesus Christ, for they never were in it. Similarly, the apostles never "officially cancelled" circumcision "as a rite of the Christian Church" (as Mr. Madsen says they did), for the simple reason that there never was such "a Christian sacrament" as circumcision, and there is no text in Scripture which even remotely suggests that there was.

In the light of the definite Scriptural statements that the church of Christ was not established till after the words of Matthew 16:18 were spoken, and that there is a change of law in the New Covenant, what becomes of Mr. Madsen's statement that "there is no argument which Baptists urge against infant baptism, which cannot also be urged against infant circumcision"? When God desired that Abraham be circumcised, he commanded it. When God wanted Abraham's male children to be circumcised, what did He do? He gave once more the definite command: "He that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every male throughout your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any foreigner that is not of thy seed" (Genesis 17:12). As a doctrine, infant circumcision is "actually asserted--as a practice, actually commanded; and clear and undeniable instances, with divine sanction, are recorded." Does this hold good of infant baptism? No Pedobaptists dare say so. And the change in covenants and law forbids us taking it as a necessary inference that infants are now in the Church of God because they formerly were in "the Jewish Church."

DID CIRCUMCISION ADMIT INFANTS INTO THE

CHURCH? Our Methodist friends are arguing that since circumcision "was the sacrament of admission into the membership of the Church of God before the coming of Christ," and since the apostles insisted on "baptism as the initiatory sacrament of admission to the membership of the

Church," therefore baptism, as circumcision, should be administered to infants. This argument is already shattered, as we have proved that the requisite church identity or continuity does not exist. The body of Christ into which baptism is initiatory (1 Corinthians 12:13) was not in existence in the days of Abraham.

Now, we shall prove that the second assumption of Mr. Madsen and his confreres is also groundless. We deny that it can be proved that Jewish children were ever initiated into "the Jewish Church" by circumcision. They were circumcised because they were in, not in because they were circumcised. If this be so, then the fact that baptism is an initiatory ordinance, while circumcision was not, will strongly militate against the Pedobaptists position.

It may be noted that we may improve upon our usual custom of beginning our refutation of Mr. Madsen's argument by quoting other Pedobaptists against him. On this occasion we prefer to quote the author of *The Question of Baptism* against himself, since he is more likely to acknowledge the worth of this authority. After earnestly contending for circumcision as "the Sacrament of admission," Mr. Madsen writes:

"The covenant promise was so jealously guarded that a dreadful threat rested upon the uncircumcised--'he shall be cut off from his people.' Here was excommunication pronounced upon such as neglected circumcision" (p. 25).

We beg to point out that you cannot "cut off" anything from that to which it was not previously attached. You cannot put one out of a place which he never was in. It is impossible to excommunicate or expel from a church one who never was a member of it. For instance, it would be beyond the power of anybody on earth to excommunicate me from the Methodist Church. Methodists do not "excommunicate" unbaptized infants from their church; such are simply not in; to get in, according to Mr. Madsen, they must be baptized. Accordingly, it is evident that if the uncircumcised were excommunicated, as Mr. Madsen says they were, circumcision was not initiatory.

We could stop here; but somebody might say that after all this was only one of the numerous cases of Pedobaptists inconsistency, and that Mr. Madsen's first position was right, even if his second was inconsistent with it. We therefore remark that circumcision did not initiate the children to "the Jewish Church," for:

God said of "the uncircumcised male" that "that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant" (Genesis 17:14). So it was Mr. Madsen's second position that was right, and his contradictory first position must be wrong.

Circumcision was not initiatory in the case of half the members of "the Jewish Church." Females were assuredly in as well as males; yet only the latter were circumcised. Circumcision did not make them members.

During the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness, none were circumcised, yet they were in "the Church" and covenant (Joshua 5:2-9).

We have next to notice the third assumption of the Pedobaptists argument from circumcision. The question is,

HAS BAPTISM TAKEN THE PLACE OF CIRCUMCISION?

Mr. Madsen gives himself an unnecessarily severe task, for he declares that Paul "identifies circumcision with baptism." Mr. Madsen ought to know that this is an absurd way of talking, for no two things can be identical: a thing is only identical with itself. If baptism be identical with circumcision, then everyone baptized was circumcised, and all who were circumcised were baptized. Abraham's male children were not recipients of baptism, but of circumcision. The one act was a cutting of flesh; the other, Mr. Madsen would say, is an application of water. Remarkable identity! To save Mr. Madsen's credit, we shall charitably suppose he meant what his Pedobaptists brethren generally say, viz., that "baptism has taken the place of circumcision." This is Bannerman's statement. This is vital for the theory. True, the Bible never says that baptism came in the room of anything; but, Bible or no Bible, the Pedobaptists cause demands that the one ordinance has taken the place of the other. If this cannot be proved, then our friends are in a sad case.

Argument from resemblance or analogy is proverbially weak. It does not follow that because two things are alike in several particulars, therefore they will be found to be alike in other particulars. In the case of circumcision and baptism, the dissimilarities outnumber and outweigh the resemblances. We have the following reasons, among others, for not believing that baptism has come in the place of circumcision (to say nothing of the ludicrous view that baptism is identical with circumcision):

Males only were the subjects of circumcision; but both males and females are subjects of baptism. "Every male among you shall be circumcised" (Genesis 17:10). "They were baptized, both men and women" (Acts 8:12).

Circumcision was ordained to be performed on the eighth day. See Genesis 17:12; Leviticus 12:3. If the circumcision law holds good and applies to baptism, why do not our friends keep the law to which they appeal?

Baptism is into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit (Matthew 28:19), "into Christ" (Galatians 3:27), and initiates into the "one body" which is the Church of Jesus Christ (1 Corinthians 12:13). Circumcision did not initiate the children of old into the above, or even into "the Jewish Church."

Male servants, or slaves, and their male infants, were circumcised as property, and without regard to faith. Advocates of infant baptism never claim that it occupies this place.

The qualifications for circumcision were flesh and property. In Christianity, "the flesh profiteth nothing."

Circumcision, requiring neither intelligence, faith, nor any moral qualification, neither did nor could communicate any spiritual blessing. No one ever professed to put on Christ in circumcision. The opposite holds good of baptism.

Idiots were circumcised; for neither intellect nor any exercise of it was necessary to a covenant in the flesh. Is this true of baptism?

The right of a child to circumcision did not depend upon the intelligence, faith, piety or morality of its parents. Why, then, in substituting for it infant baptism, are the benefits withheld because of the ignorance or impiety of the parents?

Infant baptism does not in this particular exactly fill the place of circumcision. New Testament practice also disproves the assertion that baptism took the place of circumcision.

The three thousand who on Pentecost gladly heard the word and were baptized (Acts 2:41) who were they? Jews all. The apostles did not yet realize that Gentiles should be received in on the same terms with the Jews. Every male among them was already circumcised. Paul was circumcised the eighth day (Php 3:5); yet was commanded to be baptized (Acts 22:16). In the case of these persons, it is simply absurd to suggest that baptism came in the place of circumcision. On the Pedobaptists view of church continuity or identity, they must have been twice initiated into the Church of God!

Mr. Madsen has a paragraph headed "Circumcision Cancelled." He could not begin to prove that for descendants of Abraham circumcision was ever cancelled. James told Paul that it was reported of him that he told "the Jews who are among the Gentiles" "not to circumcise their children"; and he asked Paul to do certain things so that "all shall know that there is no truth in the things whereof they have been informed concerning thee" (Acts 21:20-24). Paul agreed to do as advised, which shows that the report was certainly false. If Paul knew that baptism came in the place of circumcision, it is impossible to explain his attitude. If James believed it, why did he not seek to pacify his Jewish brethren with Mr. Madsen's explanation? The fact is it was a libel to say that Paul told the Jews not to circumcise their children. Yet we know that Jews who had been circumcised were commanded to be baptized. So the theory that baptism came in the room of circumcision is exploded. The penalty for not being circumcised is today what it ever was, the "being cut off from Abraham's recognized posterity."

Mr. Madsen refers to the decision of Acts 15, and says the apostles "formally discredited circumcision, and officially cancelled it as a rite of the Christian Church."

Again, he writes:

"Circumcision being thus officially cancelled as a Christian Sacrament, and Christ having ordained baptism as the sign of admission into His Church, the conclusion is obvious and unavoidable, that Baptism thereafter held the field, and circumcision died out. This Council gave the Old Testament rite its death-blow in all Christian thought, and obliterated it from all Christian practice" (p. 29).

Now, as circumcision never was a "rite of the Christian Church," it needed no cancellation in this regard. If Mr. Madsen means to say that circumcision ceased to be practiced by Christians, after the decision of Acts 15, then he ought to read his New Testament more carefully. The very next chapter says Paul "took and circumcised" Timothy. The rite surely had not "received its death-blow" if Paul could do this. Years after, as we have seen, Paul agreed with James that there was no truth in the report that the apostle to the Gentiles had told Jews not to circumcise their children. Circumcision never was "a Christian Sacrament"; while, on the other hand, it was not interfered with by the apostles as a practice which believing Jews could continue to observe in the case of their own children. What Acts 15 settled by apostolic authority, and what Paul afterwards contended for, was that the Gentile Christians should not be required to submit to circumcision.

But Paul never once gave a suggestion that either Gentiles or Jews were exempt on the ground that baptism had taken the place of circumcision.

Colossians 2:11-12.

It is this passage which Mr. Madsen declares makes it evident that "St. Paul identifies Circumcision with Baptism." It will be well, therefore, to notice the text. Paul says: "In whom [i.e., Christ] ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead." Later, in *The Question of Baptism*, Justin Martyr is quoted as declaring: "We have received not carnal, but spiritual circumcision, and we have received it through baptism." Dr. Carson is referred to as saying that "the circumcision of Christ came in the room of the circumcision of Moses" and that "circumcision and baptism correspond in meaning." Thereupon Mr. Madsen adds a remark which has a naivete which is in some respects charming, but which should hardly deceive a Methodist baby, that "the matter of correspondence being admitted on both sides, we may pass on," etc. Is it necessary to point out that there is a vast difference between saying that we receive Christ's spiritual circumcision in baptism and saying that that circumcision is baptism? Many who believe the former deny the latter. Mr. Madsen has in great part reproduced John Wesley's argument, except that Wesley evidently did not believe that baptism was identical with circumcision, but rather that "baptism came in the room of circumcision," "our Lord appointing one positive institution to succeed another." Wesley, in his *Notes on the New Testament*, writes: "With a circumcision not performed with hands--By an inward, spiritual operation. In putting off, not a little skin, but the whole body of the sins of the flesh--All the sins of your evil nature. By the circumcision of Christ--By that spiritual circumcision which Christ works in your heart. "Colossians 2:12. Which he wrought in you, when ye were as it were buried with him in baptism." We may accept every word of that, and be far from suggesting that the "circumcision" of Colossians 2:11 is the "baptism" of Colossians 2:12.

Meyer says on the passage:

"It is not, however, baptism itself. .. that is meant by the circumcision of Christ." While he does not think "not made with hands" proves this, yet he considers that what is meant is "the spiritual transformation, that consecration of a holy state of life, which takes place in baptism." In *Dummelow's Commentary*, which is cited in other connections by Mr. Madsen, and which is thought so highly of by the Methodist Church of Victoria that it is prescribed as a text-book in each of the four years of the Probationers' Course of Study,--there is the following paraphrase of Colossians 2:11 :—"You need no physical circumcision, for in your conversion you received a spiritual circumcision, not the mere cutting away of a fragment of the body, but the removal of the whole carnal nature. Really, this went back to the death of Christ in which He underwent this spiritual circumcision."

Prof. A. S. Peake, in the *Expositors' Greek Testament*, has this comment:

"The Apostle does not merely leave them with the statement that they have been made full in Christ, which rendered circumcision unnecessary, but adds that they have already received circumcision, not material, but spiritual, not the removal of a fragment of the body, but the

complete putting off of the body of flesh. .. A definite historical fact is referred to, as is shown by the aorist. This was their conversion, the inward circumcision of the heart, by which they entered on the blessings of the New Covenant. The outward sign of this is baptism, with which Paul connects it in the next verse. But it cannot be identified with it, for it is not made with hands."

There are two things in Colossians 2:1-23 which to us seem conclusive against Mr. Madsen's use of the passage as part of an argument in favor of infant baptism:

1. The circumcision which the Christian has is "not made with hands." Of no baby which I have ever seen "baptized," was it true that the operation was "not made with hands."

2. Paul says the Colossians had "been buried with him in baptism, wherein" they "were also raised with him through faith in the working of God." No babe since the world was, at the time of baptism, had faith in the working of God, though I have seen many manifest considerable displeasure with the work of men. It is this reference to faith in Colossians 2:12, which makes the Methodist Prof. Beet refer to Paul's statement as one of two "most important assertions about Baptism in the New Testament" which "are altogether inapplicable to the Baptism of infants." The foregoing study of the circumcision argument shows that baptism is not the same ordinance with circumcision; that on the contrary it was an ordinance of a different covenant in which there was a change of law; that baptism was an initiatory rite as infant circumcision was not; that the Church of Jesus Christ into which baptism is initiatory was not established for nineteen centuries after Abraham's receiving of the covenant of circumcision; and that there is no Pedobaptists body on earth which would claim that the subjects of circumcision (as mentioned in Genesis 17:1-27) are the same with the subjects of baptism. From all of which it follows that there is no need to talk about God's having or not having changed his mind, and that it is foolish to suggest, as Mr. Madsen does, that the apostles had need of a definite command to exclude infants if they were to understand that "the baptizing commission" did not include infants. The apostles knew that whereas God, when he desired infant circumcision, had specifically commanded it, he had given no such instruction in the case of the baptism of infants. So the apostles did not exclude; they simply refrained from the impiety of including what the Lord had not included, which is precisely what we want our Pedobaptists friends now to do. That the apostles so refrained is obvious from their practice and teaching as recorded in the New Testament, as implied in the acknowledgment of the distinguished Methodist theologian and exegete, Prof. J. A. Beet, when he writes: "The entire teaching of the New Testament about baptism is valid only of those whose baptism is a confession of personal faith."

01.005. Jewish Baptism

Jewish Baptism.

"The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants."

"We note that only children born before their fathers' conversion received this Jewish Baptism. This difference from Christian Baptism, and the uncertainty about the date of its origin, make the Baptism of Proselytes an uncertain basis for argument."--Prof. J. A. Beet, Methodist.

Pedobaptist apologists generally attempt to support their argument by reference to the proselyte baptism of the Jews. They cannot get cases of infant baptism in the Bible--Old Testament or New,--so they are extremely anxious to obtain them in Biblical times if not in Biblical writings. To those who have been brought up to regard the Scriptures as their sole rule of faith and practice, this may prove an uninteresting study. All who are content to believe that God meant us to learn his will from his Word will not bother much about proselyte baptism. Mr. Madsen says: "Baptist advocates strongly deny the prevalence of baptism among the Jews in our Lord's time." Some of them doubtless do this, because we have no recorded instances there. But the chief objection which is taken to the Pedobaptists position here is this, that whether or not Jews baptized proselytes and infants does not begin to touch the question as to those whom the Lord Jesus would have baptized. He who wants to know whom the Jews of later days baptized, naturally goes to Jewish uninspired writings. He who wishes to know those whom the Lord desired to be baptized, will equally naturally go to the inspired Scriptures which are given to make us complete (2 Timothy 3:17). It is ludicrous to suggest that God meant us to learn his will as to the subjects of baptism from extra-biblical sources, or from the very people who so sadly rejected the gospel of Christ.

It is important that believers in God's Word should be warned against accepting specious arguments which might undermine its authority. In the common Pedobaptists treatment of proselyte baptism there is such a danger. It will often be found that controversialists seek for the origin of Christian baptism, or of John's baptism, in the supposed Jewish practice. Mr. Madsen quotes from A. Plummer, who in Hastings' Bible Dictionary writes thus: "Assume that baptism for proselytes was a well-established custom when John began to preach, and we have an obvious reason why John adopted the rite. Not that this was his only reason; but that, so far as the custom was of any influence, it was a recommendation and not an objection. And the same argument applies to Christian baptism, which becomes more, and not less, intelligible when we consider that it was preceded by baptism for proselytes and the baptism of John." That reference to "an obvious reason why John adopted the rite" is mischievous. What Plummer put guardedly is often expressed more rashly. The Colac Reformer, of 10th September, reports a sermon by a Presbyterian minister, in which report appears the following: "When John came on the scene there was baptism among the proselytes. Firstly, there was circumcision, secondly there was baptism, and thirdly they had to make an offering or sacrifice in the temple. That was absolutely necessary for the Jewish proselytes. John made a selection from the three rites, and he chose

baptism--spiritual cleansing."

"John made a selection"! I prefer my New Testament way of speaking: "There came a man, sent from God, whose name was John" (John 1:6). "That he should be made manifest to Israel, for this cause came I baptizing in water" (John 1:31). "He that sent me to baptize in water" (John 1:33). We would not like by unscriptural modes of speaking to seem to give reason for being ranked with those who would have liked to say John's baptism was from men, and not from heaven (Matthew 22:24-27).

Even if we assume (and it is wonderful the number of assumptions which have to be made with the Jewish proselyte baptism argument) that John knew of Jewish baptism, how far does that assumption carry us? John knew of proselyte baby baptism and so preached "the baptism of repentance" (Mark 1:4)! Therefore, also, we read that the people "were baptized by him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins" (Matthew 3:6)! Anyone can see the weakness of the argument, the halting of the logic. If baby baptism were in existence before, and if John "selected" the rite, he must have altered one important part of it, for, save in the case of our Lord who knew no sin, there is not a hint that anybody who did not repent and confess his sins was baptized by John. The argument from proselyte baptism consists of an inference added to another inference. (1) It is not proved that proselyte baptism was practiced in the days of Jesus or of John. Most modern writers seem to believe in its existence. They do not so believe on the ground of express mention or stated example. Read the following: "What is wanted is direct evidence that before John the Baptist made so remarkable a use of the rite, it was the custom to make all proselytes submit to baptism; and such evidence is not forthcoming."--A. Plummer, in Hastings' Bible Dictionary. "It is uncertain whether the later rite with which Jewish proselyte baptism was performed. .. was in existence at the foundation of the Christian Church."--P. Drews in The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.

"The details of the act of reception [of proselytes] seem not to have been settled definitely before the second Christian century."--THE Jewish Encyclopedia."

Some one may ask, How then can Plummer say, as he does, that the fact of proselyte baptism in the days of John "is not really doubtful"? The answer is that there is very great difficulty in believing that the Jews who so opposed Christ would have later borrowed a Christian rite; Plummer calls this a monstrous supposition. Most, I think, in this agree with Plummer, though some yet vigorously deny the validity of the inference, holding that the lack of any mention in the Bible and Apocrypha, in Josephus and Philo, and in the older Targumists is inexplicable if the rite existed.

(2) It is, then, an inference only, and that not an absolutely necessary one, that such baptism existed in early days. It is also an inference--and that so wild that to state it is almost sufficient to refute it--that the subjects of John's baptism or of Christ's must have been settled by the subjects of Jewish baptism.

Pedobaptist controversialists are by no means agreed amongst themselves as to the weight to be attached to this argument, even while they agree on the early existence of proselyte baptism. Particularly, has there been difference of view as to infant baptism.

Edersheim, speaking of the Jewish views, says:

"In regard to the little children of proselytes, opinions differed." The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. II, p. 746.

We call attention to J. Agar Beet's view as stated at the beginning of this article. He also states:

"It is therefore more probable than not that this undoubted Jewish practice was as early as the days of Christ. Usually, though apparently not always, the young children of such converts were also baptized, as undoubtedly their boys were circumcised. This proselyte baptism, if then practiced, would naturally suggest the Baptism of the young children of converts to Christianity."

E. Von Dobschutz, Professor of N.T. Exegesis in the University of Breslau, after speaking of the threefold ceremony of circumcision, immersion, and sacrifice, says: "The relation of this rite to the Christian sacrament of baptism has given rise to much discussion, but the present tendency to derive Christian baptism from the immersion of proselytes is incorrect, especially as the existence of sacramental ideas is not certainly proved in connection either with immersion or circumcision."--In The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia.

Here is another striking statement:

"Sometimes the attempt is made to strengthen this argument from circumcision to baptism by a reference to the baptism of the proselyte. When a proselyte was baptized, it is said, his whole household, down to its youngest member, was baptized with him; and it may be supposed that the Christian practice would conform to this custom . . . Opinions differed, however, on the subject of the baptism of the children of proselytes. . . And in any case, the analogy from proselyte baptism is not one that it is safe to apply to Christian baptism; for whatever may be thought about the younger children of the household, it is exceedingly unlikely that the older, children would be baptized by the apostles on the mere ground of their father's faith, as the analogy from proselyte baptism would suggest."--J. C. Lambert, in The Sacraments in the New Testament.

Surely these quotations will show that the argument from proselyte baptism to infant baptism as a Christian rite is far from being proved when it is rendered reasonably probable that proselyte baptism existed in the days of the Lord Jesus. If Beet confesses that it is "an uncertain basis for argument," we need not blush with shame merely because Beet's brother Methodist, Mr. Madsen, tells us we "are fighting a hopeless issue." To anyone who is interested in the amount of weight to be attached to the argument from Jewish proselyte baptism, assuming such a thing existed in the days of Jesus, we commend a consideration of the following facts. These are conclusive against the argument as generally presented.

1. The proselytes spoken of were introduced not into the church of Jesus Christ, but into the Jewish nation. "If, then, the little children of proselytes were, with their parents, grafted into the Jewish nation, it follows not that the children of Christians should, in like manner, be received into the church--which is not national but spiritual--which the Lord requires shall be composed of those only who are twice born, not of those born of the flesh nor of the will of man; but solely of those who are born again; born of God." 2. Mr. Madsen and his brethren persistently argue that baptism came in the place of circumcision. They never give proof of this, of course. Now see how their own argument that the baptism of John or Jesus was adopted from the earlier Jewish rite destroys the cogency of their former reasoning. If both baptism and circumcision were needed to initiate proselytes, surely in their case the baptism did not come in the room of circumcision. If the New

Testament ordinance were framed on the analogy of the Jewish proselyte practice, then how could New Testament baptism come in the room of circumcision? If our friends are right now, they were wrong before; if they were right before, they are wrong now. They could not twice be right; but they could be, and are, twice wrong.

2. How little weight Mr. Madsen himself really attaches to the analogy of Jewish proselyte baptism may be shown. The "Jewish baptism" was immersion. See the quotation from Von Dobschutz above. Plummer tells how the proselyte "plunged beneath the water, taking care to be entirely submerged." So also Lightfoot says. Dr. Brandt, in Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, writes: "The convert made a complete immersion." J. V. Bartlett in the same Encyclopedia remarks: "Immersion seems to have been the practice of the Apostolic age, in continuity with Jewish proselyte baptism." The Jewish Encyclopedia speaks of the tebilah or "bath of purification." Now, Mr. Madsen is not very keen on immersion; he is only keen on the analogy of Jewish baptism so far as it seems to serve his purpose.

Overlooking the difference between a Jewish "bath of purification" and a Methodist sprinkling, and assuming that proselyte baptism was practiced in New Testament days, and further assuming that infants were baptized with their parents, we are still very far from the practice of Pedobaptists now. For what children were, in the case of proselytes, so baptized? Edersheim says: "Unborn children of proselytes did not require to be baptized, because they were born 'in holiness.'"

Lightfoot, whose "Hors Hebraics" is a storehouse of Pedobaptists argument, and is quoted by Mr. Madsen, says:

"The sons of proselytes, in following generations, were circumcised indeed, but not baptized."

J. Agar Beet writes:

"We note that only children born before their fathers' conversion received this Jewish Baptism."

Proselyte baptism was not repeated on the posterity of those baptized, not given to any born after their parents became proselytes. If this pattern, then, were to guide us, then "only the children of Christians born before the conversion and baptism of their parents would be entitled to baptism, while all born afterwards would remain unbaptized." Compare this with Pedobaptists practice. Our friends really ought to allow that we are in good company when we decline to be bound as to the subjects of Christian baptism by any Jewish procedure. They themselves decline, to be thus bound. Their consistency must improve, and their reasoning also; else tracts, sermons and books alike will fail to stop the numbers from turning to the precept and practice of the Word of God and hearing, believing, being baptized.

01.006. Family Baptisms

Family Baptisms.

"If, indeed, on other grounds, we were sure that infants were baptized by the apostles, it would be natural to conclude that a household was baptized, its infant members, if there were any, would not be left out. But, in the absence of any such assurance, these cases really prove nothing at all." —J. G. Lambert, in *The Sacraments in the New Testament*. The argument from household baptisms, or, as some, including Mr. Madsen, prefer to call them, "family baptisms,"--is, despite its manifest weakness, a favorite one with Pedobaptists. That the New Testament records the baptism of some households is certain. That one of these households contained an unbeliever or an infant too young to believe, no one could prove if his salvation depended upon it.

We have good reason for objecting to the way in which our Methodist friends put the matter. Mr. Madsen writes:

"The Baptist theory, with respect to these household baptisms, requires proof that every single member was not only capable of exercising faith, but actually believed, before receiving baptism." At the risk of repetition, we must point out that this is not precisely the case. Baptists and members of Churches of Christ agree in baptizing believers in Christ. When they are challenged as to their warrant for so doing, they point to New Testament command and example (e.g., Acts 2:38; Acts 8:12; Acts 10:47-48; Acts 18:8). Our friends perforce agree that we have Scriptural authority for so baptizing. When Pedobaptists baptize babies, we simply ask that they produce Scriptural warrant for their practice, as we are quite willing to give for ours. The question is, Can they give this authority? it is a poor evasion of the issue to ask us to prove that no member of the households was incapable of believing or did not believe. It is their practice, not ours, which needs justification. Why do they not give one Biblical instance of or one single command for this thing which they do in the name of the Lord? They need to show, what they have ever failed to show, that any baptized household in New Testament days contained an unbeliever or one incapable of belief.

Again, Mr. Madsen writes:

"We, however, follow Apostolic practice, and baptize the convert's family with him." This is as rich and ingenuous as the comment of Albert Barnes, the Presbyterian divine, that the story of Lydia "affords a strong presumptive proof that this was an instance of household or infant baptism." If household, why infant? Disciples of Christ believe in and practice household baptism. In his pamphlet, *One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism*, issued in answer to a Pedobaptists tract specially circulated to counteract the effect of his work in one of his great American missions, Charles Reign Scoville says: "Many whole households have come to Christ during this meeting, and no infants either." The point is not then whether household baptisms are Scriptural, but whether our Pedobaptists friends "follow apostolic practice" when they baptize unconscious infants on the strength of parental faith. If there was such "apostolic practice," why does not Mr. Madsen give us chapter and verse, and end the discussion? We have authority for what we practice; surely we are

right in asking similar authority from him. Let him produce the proof, and not try to shift the obligation.

It is sometimes said there are "five family baptisms in the New Testament." In reality, there are only three cases distinctly recorded as instances of household baptisms--the households of Lydia (Acts 16:15), of the Philippian jailer (Acts 16:33), and of Stephanas (1 Corinthians 1:16). Mr. Madsen deals with these three.

CORNELIUS. The case of Cornelius is often referred to, but it is not explicitly stated that this was a family baptism; Lambert, as will be seen from a subsequent quotation, holds the contrary. Acts 11:14, "Who shall speak unto thee words, whereby thou shalt be saved, thou and all thy house," is favorable to the view that all the household of Cornelius was included in the baptism. In any case, since the people baptized with Cornelius are said to be "all here present in the sight of God, to hear all things that have been commanded" (Acts 10:33), and since they spoke with tongues and magnified God (Acts 10:46), they must have been in a very different case from any babies baptized by Mr. Madsen. So, whether we have in Acts 10:1-48 a case of household baptism or not, we certainly have not a case of baby baptism.

CRISPUS. The household of Crispus, it is generally believed, was baptized. No one that I know of disputes it. Mr. Madsen may not have referred to it in his chapter on "Family Baptisms," because it is not specifically stated that the household was baptized; or there may have been other reasons for the silence, such reasons as will naturally suggest themselves to one who, remembering that Mr. Madsen claims to "follow apostolic practice and baptize the convert's family with him," reads carefully the following Scripture:

"And Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, believed in the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized" (Acts 18:8). This notable passage does not appear in the chapter in which the Methodist champion endeavors to enlighten his people on New Testament family baptisms.

THE JAILER. His story is recorded in Acts 16:23-34. We are told that the jailer "was baptized, he and all his" (Acts 16:33). The question is, Were there any infants here? If not, the Pedobaptists position gets no support from this household. Now, Luke says Paul and Silas "spake the word of the Lord unto him, with all that were in his house" (Acts 16:32), and that the jailer "rejoiced greatly, with all his house, having believed in God" (Acts 16:34). Methodist babies are not wont either to have the word preached to them nor to rejoice greatly at the operation of what our friends call baptism. The preaching and the rejoicing prove that Mr. Madsen does not in this case of household baptism get his authority for infant baptism.

I would like to quote a few sentences from The Question of Baptism. Of verse 34, above referred to, Mr. Madsen writes:

"This whole verse is utterly opposed to their [i. e. 'the Baptists'] contention, for it proves that the jailer brought Paul and Silas from the prison quarter proper, into his own private apartments--his home, in fact; so that the rejoicing was a purely domestic one, and confined to the bosom of his family circle."

How the fact that the rejoicing was a domestic one confined to the jailer's family circle goes to prove infant baptism and upset the Baptists' contention is not very clear. An attempted distinction between oikos and oikia will not help here. Will Mr. Madsen try to prove either of the following proposition., That there were infants in the prison quarter proper, but not in the family circle; or, That the infants of the domestic circle could hear the word and rejoice, whereas the prison quarter ones could not? If he cannot prove one of these, then I fancy that even careful Methodist readers of his sentence quoted above will write it down for the nonsense it is.

Again, Mr. Madsen says of Paul's words: "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house":

"Why should the Apostles give to an enquirer after personal salvation such a comprehensive answer, which opened the door of salvation to the man's family upon his belief, if they had not intended to disciple the family by baptizing them into the Christian Church on the strength of that belief? Had no family issue been involved, the Apostles might just as well have replied: 'Believe and thou and all mankind will be saved.'" That is an extraordinary passage. We are in it told, not merely that the house was baptized because of the jailer's faith, but that "the door of salvation" was opened "to the man's family upon his belief." The former view is risky; but the latter is outrageous. Here is a comment of Alford, the great Church of England scholar and divine, whom Mr. Madsen himself quotes on household baptisms:

"And thy house" "does not mean that his faith would save his household,—but that the same way was open to them as to him: 'Believe, and thou shalt be saved: and the same of thy household.'"

John Wesley's comment on Acts 16:34 is:

"Thou shalt be saved, and thy household—if ye believe. They did so, and were saved."

Meyer, the German commentator, writes:

"For the sake of this requirement of believing, they set forth the gospel to the father of the family and all his household." Who give sense: Alford, Wesley and Meyer or Madsen? Certainly not all four. If his view is not accepted, then Mr. Madsen cannot see why Paul should have said, "Thou and thy house," rather than "Thou and all mankind." I regret his inability to see why, but really the answer is very plain. You see, Paul happened to be in the presence of, not "all mankind," but, as Luke tells us in the very next verse, "all that were in his house." It is natural for a speaker to tell his hearers that they may be saved, and how they may be.

Again, Mr. Madsen quotes a distinguished Presbyterian Professor as referring to Paul's answer to "the jailer's selfish cry about himself." The selfishness in the jailer's cry is as purely a figment of the imagination as are the unconscious infants in the jailer's house. Is a man selfish because he says, "What must I do to be saved?" Would God that men's selfishness were often manifested thus, so that they will learn of Christ and obey him as the jailer did. It is a gratuitous insult to the man to call his a selfish cry.

STEPHANAS. In 1 Corinthians 1:16 Paul writes: "I baptized also the household of Stephanas." In this passage there is no reference whatever to the number, sex or age of the household. In the same letter there occurs this verse: "Ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the firstfruits of Achaia, and that they have set themselves to minister unto the saints" (1 Corinthians 16:15). We

often quote this passage as showing that there were no unconscious infants in the household at the time of the baptism. Mr. Madsen denies that 1 Corinthians 16:15 proves this. He writes:

"But what is, perhaps accidentally; overlooked, is that the baptism of the 'household,' and the ministry of the 'house,' of Stephanas did not follow one another in an immediate order. When Paul recalls the baptism of this family, he mentions it at a time so long before he writes of it, that he is quite uncertain in his recollection as to the names of the persons he had then baptized." There is no need for an advocate of believers' baptism to overlook, accidentally or otherwise, the lack of the "immediate order" referred to. The question is as to the amount of time which elapsed between the baptism and the ministering on the part of the house. I hope that Mr. Madsen "accidentally overlooked" the fact that we are not without the data necessary to judge of the duration of the interval. It is grossly misleading to ignore this data and write of "a time so long before."

Paul tells us that he himself baptized the household of Stephanas (1 Corinthians 1:16), and that the house of Stephanas was "the firstfruits of Achaia" (1 Corinthians 16:15). When did Paul first preach in Achaia? Every Sunday School child ought to know that it was during his second missionary journey. See the record of that tour in Acts 15:36 to Acts 18:22. 1 Corinthians, it is generally agreed, was written within six years of the beginning of the second missionary journey; and it is obvious that Paul did not get to Achaia for a considerable time after beginning his journey. For the tour and the Epistle respectively, the following dates are given: Dummelow, 49-50 and 55 or 56; Conybeare and Howson, 51-54 and 57; Ramsay, 50-53 and 55. Now it hardly needs argument that Methodist babies sprinkled by Mr. Madsen do not set themselves to minister unto the saints within five or six years of their "baptism." So the case of Stephanas will not help his cause. The suggested difference between "household" and "house," I shall notice later.

LYDIA.

Lydia's is the one instance of a household baptism in which the immediate context itself does not prove that infants were not among the baptized. We agree with Mr. Madsen in his belief that Acts 16:40, which says that Paul and Silas "entered into the house of Lydia; and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them, and departed," does not settle the matter. But we heartily disagree with the ludicrous reason which Mr. Madsen advances for this belief: "Unless the Baptists contend that a Sister is a Brother, in defiance of all proper discriminating terms of sex, Lydia was not present at this farewell gathering" (p. 43). A person who writes thus ought to read the epistle which Paul later wrote to Philippi. In it he addresses his readers generally as "brethren" (Php 1:12; Php 2:1; Php 2:17; Php 4:1, Php 4:8); yet he can send a message to two sisters (Php 4:2). Paul in this did not write in defiance of proper discriminating terms; he did what we all do today.

While the story of Lydia does not of itself explicitly exclude infants, it yet contains no suggestion that infants were either present or baptized. The only folk of Philippi mentioned as being present at the river-side meeting were women (Acts 16:13).

Before any support whatever can accrue to the Pedobaptists position from this woman's case, four things have to be assumed: (1) That Lydia had her children with her so far away from her home in Asia; (2) That at least one of her children was too young to believe; (3) That Lydia had any children at all; (4) That Lydia was a married woman. No Pedobaptists could give any proof for any one of these assumptions. Let hint try! Yet without such imaginations, the case does not support the

Pedobaptists claim. Now, assumption is not a good enough warrant for a church ordinance.

We say that it is only right to interpret Lydia's case in harmony with the other believing households and with the uniform teaching and example of the New Testament. If infant baptism were elsewhere authorized or recorded, we might assume it here; but this precept and example cannot be produced.

OIKOS AND OIKIA.

These two words are of very frequent occurrence in the New Testament. Both are translated "house" or "household." Frequently our Pedobaptists friends, when they are clearly shown to be unwarranted in seeking to get authority for their practice from the accounts of the "family baptisms" as given in our English versions, hazard the argument that the use of the Greek word *oikos* rather than of *oikia* in certain texts tends to prove their case. The person who is utterly ignorant of Greek is apt to be persuaded that there may be something in such an argument. The theory demands that there is a clear and uniform difference in meaning between *oikos* and *oikia*; if there is not, then to insist on the distinction in a few stated passages would be manifestly wrong. We hope to show, firstly, that there is no such settled and constant difference; and, secondly, that, if there were, still the Pedobaptists argument lacks cogency. For the sake of the interested reader of English alone, it may be mentioned that in the passage generally cited in connection with household baptisms, *oikos* occurs in Acts 11:14; Acts 16:15; Acts 16:31; Acts 16:34; Acts 18:8; 1 Corinthians 1:16; and *oikia* in Acts 16:34 and 1 Corinthians 16:15.

Mr. Tait, Presbyterian minister, whose little book on Christian Baptism has just been issued under the auspices of the Publications Committee of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria, uses the argument. He, much more clearly and strongly than Mr. Madsen, puts it as follows: "These instances are instances of the baptism of families, not of households. In the New Testament the word *oikos* means 'a family' in the narrower sense of a unity under a common head, and *oikia* means 'a household' in the wider sense, including servants and dependents. It is the narrower word, which means 'a family,' that is invariably used in speaking of the baptism of several persons; and the wider word, meaning 'a household,' that is used when things are said of the persons composing it, which could not be said of children. Paul tells us that he 'baptized the family of Stephanas,' but when, in the same letter, he speaks of this good Christian, and those associated with him, as having 'set themselves to minister unto the saints,' his words are: 'Ye know the household of Stephanas.' Luke tells us that Paul and Silas said to the Philippian jailor, 'Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy family'; but when he tells us of their 'speaking the word of the Lord unto him,' he adds, 'with all that were in his household.' Of Lydia, Luke says: 'And when she was baptized and her family.' When we speak of 'a man with a family' we mean a father with children. When Paul and Luke speak of baptizing families, or families being baptized, and carefully distinguish between families and households, it certainly looks as if they meant us to conclude that there were children in these families, and that they were baptized with their parents" (pp. 18, 19).

We call attention to the ingenious way in which Mr. Tait begs the question to be proved by translating *oikos* by "family" and *oikia* by "household." He does not try to prove the right to this difference in rendering. Our English translators, both of A.V. and RV, do not thus distinguish, nor has the American Standard Revised Version regarded the alleged difference. Yet all the

translators knew something of Greek.

Again, one may ask, How will the distinction help Mr. Tait's argument? Bannerman--who was honored by the Publications Committee of the Free Church of Scotland as Mr. Tait has been by that of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria--says oikia "means 'household' in the wide sense, 'an establishment,' including not only children, but relatives, servants and dependents." Similarly, Mr. Tait speaks of oikia as "the wider word." But if oikia is wider, embracing the children and others also, how can it be maintained that oikia "is used when things are said of the persons composing it, which could not be said of children"? Nobody has dared to say that oikia differs from oikos in that the former excludes the children which may exist in the latter; Messrs. Bannerman, Tait and Madsen treat oikia as the wider, more embracing, term. Let us apply, therefore. "They spake the word of the Lord unto him, with all that were in his house" (oikia; Acts 16:32). Well, whatever children are included in oikos must be included in the wider term, oikia; and this wider "household" as well as narrower "family," then, consisted of folk old enough to hear the word of God.

Once more: In Acts 16:34 we are told the jailer "rejoiced greatly, with all his house (panoikei). The household could not only hear the word, but take such an intelligent interest in it, and be so delighted with obedience to and acceptance by the Lord as, to rejoice greatly.

Mr. Tait's argument, with its show of precise scholarship, breaks down hopelessly. Mr. Madsen quotes from Grimm's Wilke's Lexicon of N.T. Greek as to the meaning of the word oikia. We, as others, cordially accept the meanings as there stated. This lexicon gives the following meanings of oikia: (a) Prop. an inhabited edifice, a dwelling. (b) The inmates of a house, a family. (c) Property, wealth, goods. Of oikos, it says: 1. A house: (a) strictly, an inhabited house. (b) Any building whatever. (c) Any dwelling place. 2. By metonymy, the inmates of a house, all the persons forming cite family, a household. 3. Stock, race, descendants of one. Cremer's Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek gives the following meanings of oikos: (1) a dwelling; (2) a household or family; (3) household concerns. Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon is in harmony with the above. Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon is in accord, and fails to harmonize with the alleged distinction so necessary to our opponent's argument.

Mr. Madsen, however, thinks he can get some help from oikia. He writes:

"A second illustration from John 4:49-53, is submitted. In John 4:49, a nobleman appeared to Jesus: 'Sir, come down ere my child die.' The force of this appeal as an example of an argument lives in the exact wording of it: 'Come down ere my little child die.' Then in John 4:53, when the healing deed had taken place, it is reported of the nobleman: 'And himself believed and his whole house (oikia).' As Dr. Rentoul points out--'Every believing household was baptized.' Thus in John 4:49-53, we have 'a clear and interesting proof that in the household--whether the term oikia or oikos be used, the little child was an integral member, and took the status of its parent's faith." The Question of Baptism, p. 46. The unsophisticated reader may want to know what the cure of the child of the nobleman has to do with the subjects of baptism: the "little child" in question was healed, not baptized. Yet such a person will on second thoughts appreciate the subtlety of this Pedobaptists argument. Its point is that a "believing household" may include a child which is not old enough to believe personally, but which takes "the status of its parent's faith"; for it is plainly stated, "Himself believed with his whole house," and yet there was a "little child." So, the argument implies, even if the baptized households were believing households, that fact would not exclude

infants from them. To most people it will be a sufficient reply that John says the whole house believed; and, therefore, the child, however little, was old enough to believe. Our friends, however, apparently hold that this is excluded by the term "little child" (John 4:49, *paidion*, diminutive of the *pais* of John 4:51). But does *paidion* prove that a person so called was too young to believe? John, who records this story, evidently did not think so, for he represents Jesus as applying this word to the disciples who went fishing: "Children [*paidia*], have ye aught to eat?" (John 21:5). If one object that this is an accommodated use of the word, we can refer him to Mark 5:39, "The child [*paidion*] is not dead, but sleepeth." Of what age was this *paidion*? Mark says she "rose up, and walked, for she was twelve years old" (Mark 5:42). Now, if a person of twelve years of age is called in the New Testament. *paidion*, by what right does Mr. Madsen, or anyone else, seek to suggest that the nobleman's "little child" was of such a tender age that he could not believe, but must take the status of his parent's faith? Are Pedobaptists who use this argument ignorant, or are they seeking to impose on other people's ignorance? The word *paidion* does not of itself suggest inability to believe, and John distinctly says the nobleman's whole house did believe. I agree with John rather than with Mr. Madsen. It would be no trouble at all to us if the household of Lydia, the jailer, or Stephanas, contained children of the age of the "little child" of Mark 5:39. We have baptized children of such an age, on confession of their faith in Christ. It is a far cry from this to the baptism of "the infant, mewling and puking in the nurse's arms." In *The Question of Baptism*, again we read:

"Thayer, Grimm's American translator, 'holds that in Attic Greek, *oikos* means one's household establishment, regarded as an entire property; but *oikia* means the dwelling with its inhabitants. In the N.T. he thinks the words are used with discrimination, and yet in some passages 'it would seem that no distinction can be insisted on.' The passages he gives of this kind will not help the Baptist advocates" (p. 46).

Even in this passage, it is acknowledged that there is no uniformly maintained distinction in meaning between *oikia* and *oikos*. If so, who is to judge in any one case as to whether the distinction is implied? The admission of Thayer at once prevents any Pedobaptists from taking a short-cut to his conclusion from the use of the one word rather than of the other in any verse of Scripture. But Thayer's passages are said not to be such as would help the advocate of believer's baptism! Would it not be well to give Thayer's verses?

Thayer writes as follows:

"In Attic (and esp. legal) usage, *oikos* denotes one's household establishment, one's entire property, *oikia*, the dwelling itself; and in prose *oikos* is not used in the sense of *oikia*. In the sense of family, *oikos* and *oikia* are alike employed. . . . In the N.T., although the words appear at times to be used with same discrimination (e.g., Luke 10:5-7; Acts 16:31-32; Acts 16:34; cf. John 14:2), yet other pass[ages] seem to show that no distinction can be insisted upon: e.g., Matthew 9:23; Mark 5:38; Luke 7:36-37; Acts 10:17; Acts 10:22; Acts 10:32; Acts 17:5; Acts 19:16; Acts 21:8; Acts 11:11-13; Acts 16:15; 1 Corinthians 1:16; 1 Corinthians 16:15." The impression which this definite quotation from Thayer makes on the reader is not precisely similar to that made by the summary of Thayer given in *The Question of Baptism*. It will be noted that Thayer includes 1 Corinthians 1:16; 1 Corinthians 16:15 in his list of passages which "seem to show that no distinction can be insisted upon." Now the inclusion of these directly contradicts the use which Mr. Tait has made of these

very Scriptures (see extract above). So, despite the assertion that Thayer's passages will not help us, it is evident that Thayer assists to this extent, that he declares against the use which the chosen representative of Victorian Presbyterians has made of the words *oikia* and *oikos* in 1 Corinthians.

PEDOBAPTIST ADMISSIONS.

We have by an independent examination shown that there is no cogent argument in favor of infant baptism to be drawn from the New Testament accounts of the baptism of households. It is interesting to find candid Pedobaptists themselves admitting the weakness of their brothers' argument. We do not quote the following to prove our position, for it needs no further proof. Yet the reader may reflect that the argument advanced by Mr. Madsen must be weak indeed to be so summarily rejected by such an array of scholarly Pedobaptists.

"The attempt is frequently made to found at least an inferential proof upon the fact that we read in the New Testament of the baptisms of certain 'households.' The argument is one which possesses very little weight. And it would possess little weight even though we knew, which we do not, that there were infants in any of the three households that are spoken of as receiving baptism. If, indeed, on other grounds we were sure that infants were baptized by the apostles, it would be natural to conclude that when a household was baptized, its infant members, if there were any, would not be left out. But, in the absence of any such assurance, these cases really prove nothing at all. They still leave us face to face with the preliminary inquiry, Whom did the apostles regard as the proper subjects of the ordinance? In two out of the three cases just referred to, the weakness of the argument is brought home to us by other expressions that are used with reference to those very same family groups. The verse which reports the baptism of the Philippian jailer and his house is immediately preceded by another which tells that Paul and Silas 'spoke the word of the Lord unto him, with all that were in his house' (Acts 16:32). In 1 Corinthians, again, Paul informs us that he baptized the household of Stephanas (1 Corinthians 1:16); but in the same Epistle he describes that household as having 'set themselves to minister unto the saints' (1 Corinthians 16:15). These expressions, of course, do not prove that there were no infants in the houses referred to. But they do prove that when certain things are attributed to a household collectively, the language must be read with this limitation, that only those members of the house are meant to be included to whom those things properly apply. The baptism of a household, therefore, it must be said again, proves nothing, so long as we do not know whether the apostles regarded infants as proper subjects of the administration."--J. C. Lambert, in *The Sacraments in the New Testament*.

" There is no trace of it [Infant Baptism] in the New Testament. Every discussion of the subject presumes persons old enough to have faith and repentance, and no case of baptism is recorded except of such persons, for the whole 'households' mentioned would in that age mean dependents and slaves, as naturally as they suggest children to the English reader." " This is the usual sense of *oikos* in N.T., when it is not a building."--H. M. Gwatkin, Dixie Professor of History in the University of Cambridge, in *Early Church History to A.D. 313*.

Meyer, the German commentator, says of Lydia:

"Of what members her family consisted, cannot be determined. This passage and Acts 16:33, with Acts 18:8 and 1 Corinthians 1:16, are appealed to in order to prove infant baptism in the apostolic age, or at least to make it probable." He refers to Bengel's word, "Who can believe that in so many families there was no infant?"

Amongst other remarks, Meyer gives the following as being against the attempted proof:

"(1) If, in the Jewish and Gentile families which were converted to Christ, there were children, then baptism is to be assumed in those cases, when they were so far advanced that they could and did confess their faith on Jesus as the Messiah; for this was the universal, absolutely necessary qualification for the reception of baptism. (2) If, on the other hand, there were children still incapable of confessing, baptism could not be administered to those to whom that, which was the necessary presupposition of baptism for Christian sanctification, was still wanting. . . . Therefore (4) the baptism of the children of Christians, of which no trace is found in the N.T., is not to be held as an apostolic ordinance, as, indeed, it encountered early and long resistance; but it is an institution of the church, which gradually arose in post-apostolic times in connection with the development of ecclesiastical life and of doctrinal teaching."--Commentary on Acts.

H. E. Plumtre, the well-known Church of England commentator, wrote of Lydia:

"The statement that 'her household' were baptized has often been urged as evidence that infant baptism was the practice of the apostolic age. It must be admitted however, that this is to read a great deal between the lines, and the utmost that can be said is that the language of the writer does not exclude infants. The practice itself rests on firmer grounds than a precarious induction from a few ambiguous passages. (See Matthew 19:13-15). In this instance, moreover, there is no evidence that she had children, or even that she was married. The 'household' may well have consisted of female slaves and freed-women whom she employed, and who made up her familia.'--On Acts 16:15. The same writer had this comment on the jailer: "What has been said above (see Note on Acts 16:15) as to the bearing of these narratives on the question of infant baptism applies here also, with the additional fact that those who are said to have been baptized are obviously identical with those whom St. Paul addressed (the word 'all' is used in each verse), and must, therefore, have been of an age to receive instruction together with the gaoler himself."--On Acts 16:33.

Prof. J. Rawson Lumby, in his commentary on Acts in The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, writes of Lydia's household: "Of a like baptizing of a household see below (Acts 16:33), and also cp. 11:14. We are not justified in concluding from these passages that infants were baptized. 'Household' might mean slaves and freed- women."--On Acts 16:15.

"We cannot infer the existence of infant baptism from the instance of the baptism of whole families, for the passage in 1 Corinthians 16:15 shows the fallacy of such a conclusion, as from that it appears that the whole family of Stephanas, who were baptized by Paul consisted of adults."--Neander in History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles.

It frequently happens that an unworthy attempt is made to magnify the weight of the argument from household baptisms. It is sometimes allowed that infants cannot be got in any one of the households whose baptism is recorded; but the Pedobaptists apologist nevertheless says that it would be strange if in the number of households there was no infant. For instance, John Wesley

begins his note on Acts 16:15 with a translation of the words of Bengel: "Who can believe, that in so many families there was no infant?" Mr. Madsen quotes Knowling who in The Expositor's Greek Testament refers to Bengel's familiar query. This attempt to make capital out of a number of cases, no one of which by itself gives the slightest support to the desired conclusion, may therefore be noticed here. We simply point out, then, that if there were an infant in all the households together, there must have been an infant in a certain one of them. Will our friends please point out one, or give the passage which implies one?

J. C. Lambert (a Pedobaptist, and therefore quoted here) gives this crushing reply to those who try, as Mr. Madsen does, to argue from the number of cases while yet they cannot get an infant in any one case: "This argument, it must be said, is constantly presented in an altogether exaggerated form. Language is used which implies that the baptism of a household is an incident of frequent occurrence. Dr. Schaff, for example, says 'The presence of children in some of those households is far more probable than their absence in all' (Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 1. 209). And even Bengel writes, 'Quis credat in tot familiis nullum fuisse infantem?' [Who can believe that in so many families there was no infant?]. But the use of a word like 'tot' [so many] and even the balancing of 'some' of those households over-against 'all,' is decidedly misleading, since, in point of fact, there are only three households of whose baptism we read, the households, namely, of Lydia (Acts 16:15), of the Philippian jailor (Acts 16:33), and of Stephanas (1 Corinthians 16:1-24). It is not the family of Cornelius to whom the rite is said to have been administered, but a mixed company that included his kinsmen and near friends"--The Sacraments in the New Testament. Coming from an advocate of infant baptism, this is interesting.

PLUMMER ON HOUSEHOLD BAPTISMS.

Mr. Madsen returns more than once to his argument from family baptisms. In two later chapters, 7 and 8, he refers again to Prof. Plummer's treatment of the subject. On p. 71 he writes:

"Prof, Plummer, in the article on Baptism, already referred to in Hastings' Bible Dictionary, observes that instances, 'Especially those of the converts on the Day of Pentecost, of Cornelius and his friends, and of the Philippian jailer and his household, all tend to show that no great amount of instruction or preparation was at first required. But somewhat later. .. after the Church had had larger experience of unreal converts, much more care was taken to secure definite knowledge and hearty acceptance of the truths of the Gospel. This primitive freedom in admitting converts to baptism is in itself an argument in favor of infant baptism, although no baptism of an infant is expressly mentioned.'"--(Italics are chiefly Mr. Madsen's.) The reader should notice that Plummer's argument here is not that those instances were instances of infant baptism. All the cases alluded to in above extract were cited by Plummer in the immediately preceding paragraph to show that "the recipients of Christian baptism were required to repent and believe." Plummer proceeds to say, and truly, that, while belief and repentance were prerequisites to baptism in the apostolic days, there were not then found the probation and prolonged catechetical instruction of a later date. We may accept all this, and absolutely decline to admit the cogency of the "argument in favor of infant baptism." Why--we may ask, without hoping for a very reasonable answer,--why should the fact that there is in the simple apostolic requirements of faith and repentance a "freedom" compared with a probation and catechumenate, lead us to reject what Plummer acknowledges to have been the primitive requirements? Because the post-apostolic church added

to the Biblical requirements, shall we dispense with the Lord's conditions? The reasoning is not very conclusive! We prefer to follow Plummer in the safe position that "the recipients of Christian baptism were required to believe and repent" (for he can give chapter and verse for this), rather than to accept his amazing transition from a "primitive freedom" to a dispensing with the Lord's conditions.

Again, Mr. Madsen cites Plummer in connection with the objection to infant baptism made on the ground that infants cannot believe:

"Prof. Plummer disposes of the objection in the following summary:--'Whole households were sometimes baptized, as those of Lydia, Crispus, the jailer, and Stephanas; and it is probable that there were children in at least some of these. There may also have been children among the three thousand baptized at Pentecost. According to the ideas then prevalent, the head of the family represented and summed up the family. In some respects the paterfamilias had absolute control of the members of his household. And it would have seemed an unnatural thing that the father should make a complete change in his religious condition, and that his children should be excluded from it. Moreover, the analogy of circumcision would lead Jewish converts to have their children baptized. Had there been this marked difference between the two rites, that children were admitted to the Jewish covenant, but not to the Christian--the difference would probably have been pointed out, all the more so, because Christianity was the more comprehensive religion of the two. There are, therefore, prima facie grounds for believing that from the first infants were baptized.' Prof. Plummer goes on to strengthen the case by citing the words of Jesus concerning the little ones and his general attitude of benevolence towards them. This view, as presented by Prof. Plummer, appears to be all the more appealing, inasmuch as he weighs and appraises the Baptist argument, and anti-concedes a prima facie case for baptism in the case of adults, upon repentance and faith."--Zfte Question of Baptism, pp. 75. 76.

We give this long quotation, for Mr. Madsen esteems it so highly that he says it "disposes" of his opponents' argument. It disposes of it in the way the priest and the Levite disposed of the man who fell among robbers,--by passing by on the other side. Has Plummer proven or attempted to prove that there was an infant in one of the households baptized? No. Has he proven that infants were among the three thousand baptized at Pentecost? No; and he could not do so; for Luke says:

"They then that received his word were baptized: and there were added unto them in that day about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers" (Acts 2:41-42).

There may have been "children" here, but certainly not "infants," else they were the most remarkable infants that ever were on this earth, and the recipients of such church privileges as no Methodist or Anglican babies now receive. No; Plummer did not prove nor did he attempt to prove. Look back to the quotation from him, and see the prominence of "probable," "may" and "probably." When Plummer wished to show that recipients of baptism in apostolic days believed and repented, he gave the Scripture texts, and did not need to fall back on those overworked servants of the Pedobaptists cause, the blessed words "may" and "probable." We do not need to say that "probably" Methodists believe in and practice what they call infant baptism; we have their precept and practice. We are not prophets; but we can assure Mr. Madsen that the argument of those who stand by New Testament teaching and example will not be disposed of by "probably."

Plummer, we are told, strengthens his case by referring to Christ's "general attitude of benevolence" towards infants. Nobody denies Jesus' benevolence towards them. Pedobaptists do not insist on this benevolence more than we do.

Rather, we emphasize it more; for we do not think that the baptized infant has any precedence in this respect over the unbaptized one. The Lord has "benevolence towards" them all alike. But how does "benevolence" prove "baptism"? Will Plummer or Madsen hazard the suggestion that on the occasion in question Christ's benevolence towards infants was manifested in his baptism of them? Neither has dared to say so.

We think, then, that Plummer has not quite disposed of our position. Nor do we for a moment believe that he himself would say so. For it is after this alleged disposal, indeed in the very next paragraph to that quoted from by Mr. Madsen, that Plummer has the following striking admissions: "Not only is there no mention of the baptism of infants, but there is no text from which such baptism can be securely inferred."

"It is probable that all that is said in Scripture about baptism refers to the baptism of adults." This is a strange disposal of our position!

01.007. Jesus and the Little Ones

Jesus and the Little Ones.

"Of that reference to, infant baptism which it is so common to seek in this narrative, there is clearly not the slightest trace to be found." --Olshausen, Matthew 19:13-14.

There is a common fallacy which logicians call *ignoratio elenchi*, which includes cases of "proving the wrong point." Often if a man is asked to justify a certain statement of which proof is very difficult, if not impossible, he will defend instead another proposition for which the former may be mistaken. Mr. Madsen evidently is a believer in the skillful use of this fallacy in support of a feeble cause. For, when asked to prove his position that Jesus wishes infants baptized, he seeks to prove instead, what no one denies, that Jesus cares for them. We have already seen how Christ's general attitude of benevolence towards little children is advanced in support of, not our benevolence towards, but baptism of, infants. The underlying assumptions of this argument are preposterous; it is foolish to suggest that baptism must accompany benevolence; and it is an unworthy insinuation that they who do not baptize infants are not so well-disposed towards them as the most ardent Pedobaptists are. There is, in *The Question of Baptism*, an absurd parade of the care of and benevolence towards children which infant baptism shows. Such a parade is no new thing in this connection. Some readers will remember Keble's lines on "Holy Baptism," with their outrageous suggestion: "Where is it mothers learn their love? In every Church a fountain springs O'er which th' eternal Dove Hovers on softest wings." Now, Keble no more needed to be reminded that mothers do not require to have their children baptized in order to love them, than Mr. Madsen stands in need of a reminder that to decline to baptize unconscious infants whose baptism the Lord has not warranted is a very different thing from being ill-disposed towards them. Benevolence is not a reason for baptism. We should be well-disposed towards all men; Christ had a heart of love for all: but this is no reason for baptizing non-believers. In a later chapter we hope to show how infant baptism has been associated with the doctrine of original sin. Even John Wesley declared: "Infants need to be washed from original sin: therefore they are proper subjects of baptism." We might retort, then, that they who deny that infants need baptism are more benevolent towards them than are those amongst the Pedobaptists, who have believed or do now believe that infants need remission of sins. We agree most profoundly with the statement of J. A. Beet, a Methodist divine, that "there is not one word in the New Testament which even suggests in the slightest degree that spiritual blessings are, or may be, conveyed to an infant by a rite of which he is utterly unconscious." This, coupled with the fact that there is no hint in the Scriptures of infant baptism, surely should prevent people from suggesting that they who do not baptize infants somehow neglect them, love them little, or are not benevolently disposed towards them. In this article we have to treat of some passages about children which are not statements as to baptism at all, but which are alleged to contain "allusions which make it very difficult to refuse" infants Christian baptism.

"OF SUCH IS THE KINGDOM."

Mr. Madsen refers to Matthew 19:14 and Matthew 18:1-10. Jesus said: "Suffer the little children, and forbid them not to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven." and "Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me."

Now there is not a word about baptism in these verses. Mr. Madsen would not venture to assert that the children were baptized on this occasion. The disciples were rebuked; but there is not a syllable to show that the blessing desired by the parents involved baptism, or that the disciples were rebuked because they objected to such baptism. If so--and of course any reader will see that it is so--how can this Scripture rightfully be used to rebuke us for declining to practice infant baptism? With what semblance of fairness can Mr. Madsen approvingly quote another Pedobaptists to the effect that on the Baptist theory the disciples' rebuke to the parents of the children was proper and righteous? The passage in question shows that if Christ were on earth it would be good to bring infants to him for his blessing. Since none of us deny this, how do we favor the original objectors or share with them the Saviour's rebuke? Let me quote a few sentences from *The Question of Baptism*:

"Of such' clearly means children similar in age and condition." "In express terms, Jesus includes the little ones in the Kingdom of Heaven. If, therefore, by Christ's own language a baby belongs to the Kingdom, how can it be refused the outward and visible sign of the Kingdom, which is baptism" (p. 51).

It is not correct to say that "in express terms, Jesus includes the little ones in the Kingdom of Heaven." The Lord definitely said, "Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God," and "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God" (John 2:3; John 2:5). The kingdom, then, consists of twice-born people. None are in the kingdom who have only been born once by a natural birth.*

Again, "of such" does not mean "of these," or mean "children of similar age and condition." Let a few Pedobaptists answer their Victorian representative. A. Plummer, after pointing out that Jesus' word is "of such," not "of these," says: "Not those particular children, nor all children, but those who are childlike in character, are possessors of the Kingdom; it specially belongs to them."--On Matthew 19:13-15.

"Of such--i.e., of childlike souls who come trustfully and unassumingly to receive (Matthew 18:2-4)."--E. E. Anderson, on Matthew 19:14.

"One of such little children. The child meant by our Lord is not a child in years, but in spirit, a person possessed of the childlike quality." Prof. E. P. Gould, on Mark 9:37, in *International Critical Commentary*.

"ton, toiouton denotes those possessing the childlike spirit of docility and humility." Cf. Matthew 18:4."--Ibid, on Mark 10:14.

We call attention to the striking words of Olshausen quoted at the head of this article. Olshausen was an able Pedobaptists, who, it will be remembered, was formerly shown to have been misrepresented by Mr. Madsen (see chapter on *The Commission*). In the light of the foregoing, it is curiously interesting to read in *The Question of Baptism*:

"Yet Baptists, after their manner, say this has nothing to do with infant baptism--'Jesus was referring to the childlike qualities which His followers should possess,' etc."--Page 52. These Baptists are in very good Pedobaptists company. But Mr. Madsen believes that such a view leaves Christ's rebuke without point; and he continues:

"It is utterly incredible that Jesus made such an ado over nothing. If this does not mean that parents are to bring their babies to Him in baptism, we require the Baptists to inform us in what other way babies can be brought to Christ, and so satisfy the express requirements involved in our Lord's language" (p. 52). With pleasure, we at last acknowledge a sentence with which we can agree. The first sentence in the above is correct. The ado was not over nothing; for the Scripture says it was about the unwarranted inhibition of the disciples. The rebuke they got for doing an unwarranted thing should make us all careful about doing unwarranted things (which is why we ask,--yet, alas! in vain--for Scriptural warrant for baby baptism). No; the ado was not over nothing; but does that prove it was over baptism? Has infant baptism become such an obsession to Mr. Madsen that it is, in his mind, the only possible antithesis to "nothing"? Of the rest of the quotation, it may suffice to say that the children in question were evidently "brought to Christ" in some "other way" than baptism. Again, it is not hinted that Jesus baptized them; but it is definitely said that he "took them in his arms, and blessed them, laying his hands upon them" (Mark 10:16). If Mr. Madsen will only imitate the Lord Jesus in this, and not seek to go beyond the Saviour's example, few will find fault with him; they will only discount the efficacy to the extent in which the disciple must perforce be less than his Lord.

"BABES AND SUCKLINGS."

Mr. Madsen makes use of Matthew 21:15-16 : "But when the chief priests and the scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children that were crying in the temple and saying, Hosanna to the son of David; they were moved with indignation, and said unto him, Hearest thou what these are saying? And Jesus saith unto them, Yea: did ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?"

One asks in wonder, What has "the perfection of praise as issuing from 'babes and sucklings' to do with baptism? Mr. Madsen asks: "Would this incident dispose them [the apostles] to ignore the babes and sucklings in carrying out their commission?" No, it could not dispose them to ignore anybody; but neither could it dispose them to baptize anybody whose baptism the Lord did not ask. We could apply the question to other things than baptism;

"Would this incident dispose them to ignore the babes and sucklings" in the Lord's Supper? Whatever cogency would be in Mr. Madsen's answer to this second question will tell against the former one. As a fact, when infant baptism came in, infant communion also came in; and there is as much reason or want of reason in the one practice as in the other. But Mr. Madsen has another curious sentence under this same heading. He thinks that the later command to disciple the nations; would be interpreted in the light of the fact, as he deems it, that the "babes and sucklings" of Matthew 21:16 are themselves in Scripture called "disciples." He says:

"In Luke's narrative of the same incident, the children are included in the term 'disciples.' Thus:--'The whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice,' while the call for suppression ran:--' Master, rebuke Thy disciples.' Luke 19:37-39."--Pages 54, 55.

This is interesting. We have but one objection to the statement that Luke includes the "babes and sucklings" (which Matthew alone mentions) in the term "disciples" (alone used by Luke). That objection is that the statement is demonstrably incorrect. The interested reader is asked to peruse Matthew 21:1-17 and Luke 19:29-46. He will learn that there were two occasions on which, according to Matthew, people cried "Hosanna to the son of David." "The multitudes" did it on the way from Bethphage to Jerusalem (Matthew 21:8-9); and, later, in the temple, the children did it (Matthew 21:15-16). It was regarding the second or temple incident that the Saviour used the quotation concerning "babes and sucklings." Now Luke's statement about the "disciples" refers to Matthew's former incident, and not to the latter or temple one at all; for he says, "As he was drawing nigh, even at the descent of the Mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice" (Luke 19:37). From Mark we learn that the temple cleansing and conflict with the chief priests and scribes took place on the day after the triumphal entry, Jesus on the day of entry having merely entered the temple and "looked round about upon all things" (see. Mark 11:1-18). Anyone who reads can see that in Luke 19:45-46, there is a very much abridged account of what happened in the temple, i.e., of the second incident recorded by Matthew. Mr. Madsen has simply made a confusion which a child in the intermediate division of a Sunday School should blush at making. Thus another argument in the book praised by our Methodist friends for its "convincing" nature and "judicious" references lies shattered in the dust.

"FEED MY LAMBS." So Jesus said to Peter (John 21:15), and Mr. Madsen uses the text as an argument in favor of infant baptism. Even if the "lambs" were infants, the text would obviously only furnish an argument for feeding them, and not for baptizing them. We have before pointed out how, in the absence of any text which contains within itself a reference to both babies and baptism, the Pedobaptists apologist gets one baptism text and another text with infants, and by a process akin to that of a skilled juggler with two balls makes such lightning changes and passes as to deceive the onlooker. But now we see a stranger thing. Our friend is so poverty-stricken in argument that he has to take a text in which neither babe nor baptism is to be found, and make it apply to both! Other people than Pedobaptists in our present opponent's anxious case will remember that, even if we insist that the "lambs" of John 21:15 represent a different class from the "sheep" of John 21:16, there are "babes in Christ" who need feeding (1 Corinthians 2:1). A few quotations from believers in infant baptism will show that we need not apologize for declining to admit, in the absence of any attempted proof, that the "lambs" of John 21:1; John 21:5 were infants.

"Every spiritual shepherd of Christ has a flock, composed of LAMBS--young converts, and SHEEP--experienced Christians, to feed, guide, regulate and govern. "--ADAM CLARKE (Methodist) on John 21:15.

"The 'lambs' there are probably neither Christian children, nor recent converts, but, like the 'sheep' in John 21:16-17, Christians in general, the name being one of affection: cp. 1 Peter 5:2-3."--Dummelow's One Volume Bible Commentary on John 21:15.

Meyer says that by all three words ("lambs" "sheep," "little sheep") Jesus "means His believing ones in general (1 Peter 5:4), without making a separation between beginners and those who are matured, or even between clergy and laity.

TO YOUR CHILDREN (Acts 2:39). The same apostle Who received the injunction, "Feed my lambs," later said: "For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even

as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him" (Acts 2:39). Mr. Madsen thinks that Pentecost bears witness to the impression which John 21:15 made on Peter's mind; and evidently believes that "to your children" refers to infant baptism. What Mr. Madsen implies is frequently explicitly stated, For instance, Mr. F. Delbridge, B.A., Editor of the Tasmanian Recorder and Methodist, in an editorial on "Infant Baptism an Apostolic Practice," wrote on Acts 2:39 : "The particular word used for children in the passage (Gk. 'teknois') apparently indicating that he meant, not posterity, as is claimed by some, but the children of those he was addressing. For 'posterity' Peter uses a different word in the next chapter, viz., 'huios' (Acts 2:25). Seeing, too, that these words were immediately preceded by an exhortation to baptism (Acts 2:38), it is not likely that Peter would exclude the children from that ordinance."

We would in reply call attention to a few things. (1) The word teknon (for teknois is either a misprint or a slip on Mr. Delbridge's part) does not show that literal children are meant; for it is repeatedly used in the New Testament in another sense than that of actual and immediate descendants (cf. Matthew 2:18; John 8:39; Romans 8:16-17; 1 Timothy 1:2). (2) Does Peter by using huios for posterity in Acts 2:25 show that he limits the meaning of teknon to the literal children of those addressed? This is impossible, for in his epistle Peter writes to Christian women: "As Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose children [tekna] ye now are" (1 Peter 2:6). (3) Both huios and teknon are used of a literal child and of posterity. (4) Even if Mr. Delbridge's assertion were as true as it is demonstrably incorrect, and we were to grant that the "children" of Acts 2:39 were the immediate offspring of those addressed by Peter, would that fact prove they were infants? Not at all. It is an almost constant vice of Pedobaptists advocates that they confuse children with infants. Teknon is often found of those who are of mature age, or far beyond the period of infancy. (See Matthew 21:28; Luke 15:31; 1 Timothy 1:2; 1 Timothy 1:18; Titus 1:6; etc.) (5) Can we learn from the account in Acts 2:1-47 who were the subjects of baptism? Yes. In the first place, consider what was "the promise" which was offered to the children with others: it was, "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38). That is the only promise stated in this connection. That promise was conditioned by Peter on two things, repentance and baptism; for he said: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Now this promise, with its antecedent conditions, was declared to be to the children" (Acts 2:39). These children must have been folk who could fulfill the expressed conditions of Acts 2:38. It is illegitimate to seek to transfer to one who cannot fulfill the conditions a promise expressly made on certain conditions: Again, it is sand that the promise was for "even as many as the Lord our God shall call" (Acts 2:39). The promise then is surely for those who can hear and obey God's call rather than for those who cannot do this. Yet once more: We are not left in doubt as to the people who were baptized on Pentecost. Were they infants? No; for Luke says: "They then that received his word were baptized: and there were added unto them in that day about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers" (Acts 2:41-42). Clearly all who were baptized were hearers and receivers of the apostle's words. Our Methodist friends "baptize" folk who cannot be so described. In addition, "they" of Acts 2:42 are those who in Acts 2:41 are said to have received the word and been baptized. So they were old enough for Christian instruction and church fellowship. The baptized persons of Acts 2:41 are the communicants of Acts 2:42.

Methodists retain infant baptism, but reject the practice of infant communion which came in with it.

Lambert, although a Pedobaptist, declines to admit the cogency of the argument often drawn from Acts 2:39. Of the contention that "children" means not posterity but immediate offspring, he says: "This view does not seem to be in harmony with the balance of the apostles thoughts." Then he continues in the following interesting fashion: "But even if this particular point were conceded, and it were held that it is the sons and daughters of his hearers to whom the apostle refers, it cannot be said that his words contain any suggestion that infant children should be baptized. His call to those men was a call to repentance, repentance specifically for the sin of rejecting Jesus (Acts 2:23, Acts 2:26, Acts 2:37), and to baptism as a sign of their repentance on the one hand, and of God's forgiveness on the other. There is nothing to lead us to believe that he was urging them to have their young children baptized as well as themselves. In point of fact, it seems evident that there were no infants among the three thousand persons to whom the rite was administered on the day of Pentecost, since those who were baptized are expressly described as they that gladly received his word' (Acts 1:1)."--The Sacraments in the New Testament, p. 197. In a later chapter, Mr. Madsen refers to Acts 2:38, and, in his zeal to make a point against the Baptists, writes: "Repentance is the title to baptism in this passage, but Baptists say, not repentance, but the evidence of it—faith—is the only valid title. Would a Baptist minister baptize a Pagan or a Jew on the same day as the man heard the gospel for the first time and before his repentance was assured?" (p.67). In a footnote on the same page Neander is quoted as follows: "At the beginning, when it was important that the Church should rapidly extend itself, those (among the Jews) who confessed their belief in Jesus as the Messiah, or (among the Gentiles) their belief in one God and Jesus as the Messiah, were, as appears from the New Testament, immediately baptized."

Mr. Madsen is quite right in citing evidence to disprove an unscriptural probationary theory, and both Acts 2:1-47 and Acts 16:1-40 are against that. But yet our author trips. He overlooks that Acts 2:1-47 does not make repentance, and dispense with faith as, "the title to baptism:" Had the people who cried out "What shall we do?" (Acts 2:27), and to whom Peter said, "Repent and be baptized," not faith? The apostle had by most cogent reasoning convinced them that the murdered Jesus was Lord and Christ. It was because they believed this testimony that they were "pricked in their heart" and asked for direction. Plummet, in his article on "Baptism" in Hastings' Bible Dictionary, states the position exactly. Of Acts 2:38, he says: "Here repentance is expressed, and faith in Jesus Christ is implied." Again, even if we were to allow that Acts 2:1-47 made repentance and not faith "the title to baptism," show would that fact help the Pedobaptists cause? Are we to understand that the infants baptized by Mr. Madsen have repentance but not "the evidence of it, faith"? In the third place, there is a discrepancy between Mr. Madsen's stated position and the quotation from Neander. Mr. Madsen finds fault with the Baptists for making faith the title, and yet he quotes Neander, who says that they who confessed that faith were immediately baptized.

Acts 21:4-5. This passage, although it does not refer to baptism at all, is referred to by Mr. Madsen. The reader of it would wonder how even the neediest Pedobaptist controversialist could use such a Scripture. The Question of Baptism puts the argument thus: "In Acts 21:4-5, there is a description of Paul's farewell to the 'disciples' at Tyre, in which it is shown that men, women, and children took part in the prayer meeting on the sea beach. Had the children not been expressly mentioned as included in the company of disciples, on Baptist principles we might conclude that the Apostles had positively ignored Christ's peremptory words concerning the little ones. But here are married men, with their wives and families denominated as 'disciples'." (pp. 55, 56). The most

certain way of refuting an attempted biblical proof of infant baptism is to quote the Scripture passage involved. In Acts 21:4-5, Luke says: "And having found the disciples we tarried there seven days: and these said to Paul through the Spirit, that he should not set foot in Jerusalem. And when it came to pass that we had accomplished the days, we departed and went on our journey; and they all, with wives and children, brought us on our way, till we were out of the city: and kneeling down on the beach, we prayed." A few remarks will show the emptiness of fine argument stated above. Many modern disciples take their children both to beach and to prayer meeting. That fact does not begin to suggest that they believe in infant baptism. Again, Mr. Madsen assumes that the word rendered "children" implies that those so designated were infants. That assumption cannot be proved; for we have shown that the same word (in singular or plural) is used of grown-up persons. (Matthew 21:28; Luke 15:31; 1 Peter 1:14; 1 Peter 2:6, etc.). But Mr. Madsen's strong point is that "the children" (in the sense of "infants," else the proof vanishes) are "expressly mentioned as included in the company of disciples:" So if infants are "disciples," they must have been baptized, since baptism has already been referred to by Mr. Madsen as the method of making disciples. The answer is that the children are not mentioned as included in the disciples. Read the passage again. The words "they all" in Acts 21:5 refer to the "disciples" of Acts 21:4. The disciples with their wives and children accompanied Paul's party. Now, if I say that certain Methodists went with me to a certain place, shall I fairly be represented as having been "expressly mentioned as included in the company of" Methodists? Surely not. So, whether infants were there or not, it has yet to be proved that the children of Tyre are called "disciples."

PAULS LETTERS.

"Paul," writes Mr. Madsen, "inserts references to children as church members in his letters." Mr. Tait, in his book on Baptism, refers more specifically to Ephesians 6:14, and Colossians 2:20. This is another instance of the fallacy of irrelevant conclusion. Mr. Madsen has to show Scriptural warrant for baptizing infants, instead of doing which he shows that children were in the church.

We cordially agree that children were in the apostolic church. There are today in our congregations hundreds to whom we pass on the apostle's exhortation: "Children, obey your parents in all things, for this is well-pleasing in the Lord." But how does this prove infant baptism or membership? Did Mr. Madsen ever gravely admonish his infant candidate in such language? The very fact that many children are to be found to-day in congregations not practicing infant baptism should keep our Pedobaptists friends from seeking to support their cause by suggestions that children are ignored or neglected when not baptized as infants. "Children properly trained may be brought savingly to know and love the Saviour. When they do so they are fit subjects for baptism, and should then intelligently take their place in the church, to be henceforth exhorted to obey their parents and to serve the Lord in everything. The proper subjects, then, for baptism, are not then, women or children, as such; but persons who confess repentance towards God and faith in Christ."

2 JOHN.

Here is one of the gems in Mr. Madsen's book: "John thought it worth while to send a private letter (the Second Epistle) to a mother and her children, which he concludes with salutations from their little cousins. How very remarkable this reads in the light of the Baptist theory, which boldly affirms that when children are referred to in Church terms, they must necessarily be old enough to be believers, in the evangelical sense of the word" (p. 56).

Mr. Madsen's own words give such an appropriate comment that we requote them: "How very remarkable this reads"! The man who argues from greetings between cousins in "a private letter" to the baptism of unconscious infants is proclaiming how hard pressed he is. A cause which needs such support is surely weak. We had better beware! If in our next letter we say, "Johnny sends his love to his cousins," we shall be cited as being on the Pedobaptists side! But how did Mr. Madsen know they were "little cousins"? The word "children" will not prove it, for reasons previously given (see Matthew 21:28; also, the word tekna is often used of men who are children of God). It is assumption that any of the "children" to whom the salutation was sent or of those who gave it were infants. As one reads *The Question of Baptism*, one often thinks, If only assumption were argument, how powerful a disputant Mr. Madsen would be! Surely it ought to be clear to the most casual reader that if the children were old enough to be interested in apostolic epistles, they were not of the age of the babies whose baptism Mr. Madsen seeks to justify. Otherwise we can only say they were "very remarkable" infants. Again, in 2 John 1:4 we have mention of the fact that John found certain of the "children" of the elect lady "walking in truth." If these could do so, it is foolish imagination to suppose that those of verses 1 and 13 could not or did not do likewise.

We may add that it is still keenly debated whether the "elect lady" was a church or a Christian matron. Allowing the latter, we point out that Mr. Madsen has shown neither infants nor baptism to be involved in the epistle.

CHILDREN OF CHRISTIAN PARENTS HOLY (1 Corinthians 7:14).

Mr. Madsen employs the usual argument drawn from this passage. He says: "The remarkable statement of Paul to the Corinthian converts has to be reckoned with by the advocates of the Baptist exclusive theory. 'For the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.' (1 Corinthians 7:14.) To contend that this reference has to do with the question of the legitimacy of marriage and its issue, is a convenient way of getting rid of a difficult passage in the path of the Baptist theory. Sound exegesis, however, lends such interpretation no support. It is manifestly special pleading with the intention of removing an awkward text" (*The Question of Baptism*, pp. 57, 58)

If anyone will read 1 Corinthians 7:1-40, he will find that the apostle was discussing the question of marriage. The question was raised, Should a believing wife depart from her heathen husband, or the Christian husband from his pagan wife? Paul replied that there was no need to do so, since the unbelieving partner was "sanctified" by the believing spouse. See 1 Corinthians 7:10-14. So it is not "a convenient way of getting rid of a difficult passage" to see its reference, not to baptism, but to marriage. Paul adds a word to enforce his point: If in such a marriage the believer was desecrated by intercourse with a heathen, then the children would be unclean; as it is, they are holy. Paul, says G. G. Findlay in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, "appeals to the instinct of the religious parent; the Christian father or mother cannot look on children, given by God through marriage, as things unclean."

Now, does this argument of Paul's imply, as Mr. Madsen quotes Godet as affirming, that the custom of infant baptism existed? We shall see.

We first ask the reader to note that Paul does not speak merely of holy children, he speaks also of a hallowed parent. The word translated "sanctified" in 1 Corinthians 7:14 is the verb cognate with the adjective translated "holy" in the same verse. The unbelieving husband is "sanctified" by the wife. Findlay puts it that "the sanctification of the one includes the other so far as their wedlock is concerned." We never heard of anybody suggesting that the unbelieving husband should be baptized because of his holiness as expressed in this passage; yet the holiness of the children is no more clearly stated. In the second place, whatever others may do consistently, some of our Methodist friends cannot get much in favor of their practice from 1 Corinthians 7:14. If Mr. Madsen seeks to get an argument from the children's holiness, he should notice that Paul's words only refer to children of whom one parent at least is a believer. "Else were your children unclean," Paul says. Now, Mr. Madsen's book begins with a quotation from the Methodist Book of Laws: "All children, by virtue of the Universal Atonement of Christ, are members of the Kingdom of God, and are entitled to be received into the visible Church of Christ by baptism." Whatever other Scriptures may be referred to in support of this statement, it is quite evident that the "holy" of 1 Corinthians 7:14 cannot so be used; for holiness in the sense in which Paul here uses it is definitely limited to children of a believing parent and is predicated also of the unbeliever married to a Christian. Thirdly, we would like to point out that such a view of the passage as we have given is not peculiar to ourselves. Many Pedobaptists state their conviction that 1 Corinthians 7:14, so far from proving the existence of infant baptism in Paul's day, definitely disproves it.

Dean Stanley, one of the finest scholars produced by the Church of England, wrote thus: "The passage, on the one hand, is against the practice of infant baptism in the Apostle's time. For (1) he would hardly have founded an argument on the derivation of the children's holiness from their Christian parent or parents, if there had been a distinct act by which the children had themselves been admitted formally into the Christian society; and (2) he would not have spoken of the heathen partner as being 'holy' in the same sense as the children were regarded as 'holy,' viz., by connexion with a Christian household, if there had been so obvious a difference between the conditions of the two, as that one was, and the other was not baptized."--Commentary on Corinthians.

Neander refers to the passage as "rather evidence against the existence of infant baptism."

H. M. Gwatkin, in his Early Church History, implies that here "St. Paul disproves the institution."

Albert Barnes, the well-known Presbyterian commentator, and a most strenuous Pedobaptist advocate, has some helpful remarks on the subject. We can only quote a few sentences. "It is a good rule of interpretation, that the words which are used in any place are to be limited in their signification by the connexion; and all that we are required to understand here is, that the unbelieving husband was sanctified in regard to the subject under discussion; that is, in regard to the question whether it was proper for them to live together, or whether they should be separated or not." Of the argument from this passage that "children are 'federally holy,' and that they are entitled to the privilege of baptism on the ground of the faith of one of the parents," Barnes has some hard things to say, among them being this: "It does not accord with the scope and design of the argument. There is not one word about baptism here; nor one allusion to it; nor does the argument in the remotest degree bear upon it. The question was not whether children should be baptized, but it was whether there should be a separation between man and wife, where the one

was a Christian and the other not."

Such words effectively turn the edge of Mr. Madsen's suggestion that only Baptists in the support of a losing cause do not agree with his view of 1 Corinthians 7:14. We could pass on to the modern champions of the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches in Victoria--Messrs. Madsen and Tait, who both use this text as an argument--the following admonition from their Pedobaptists brother: "I believe infant baptism to be proper and right, and an inestimable privilege to parents and to children. But a good cause should not be made to rest on feeble supports, nor on forced and unnatural interpretations of the Scriptures. And such I regard the usual interpretations placed on this passage."

Most readers will think this is cogent enough, but we must notice another point. Mr. Madsen writes: "Dummelow, in his recent commentary, remarks that the passage enunciates the principles which lead to infant baptism, viz., that the child of Christian parents shall be counted as a Christian."

Dummelow does quote Lightfoot to this effect. We have already asked how this could support the view that "all children. ... are entitled to be received into the visible Church of Christ by baptism."

Other Pedobaptists plead that while 1 Corinthians 7:14 does not favor the view that infant baptism existed, yet it sets forth the principles which justify the practice. Stanley, already quoted, says, "The passage asserts the principle on which infant baptism is founded."

Neander remarks:

"In the point of view here chosen by Paul, we find (although it testifies against the existence of infant baptism) the fundamental idea from which infant baptism was afterwards necessarily developed, and by which it must be justified to agree with Paul's sentiments."

Gwatkin has an interesting word:

"St. Paul's argument--'else were your children unclean, whereas in fact they are holy'--is a two-edged sword. On one side, he could not well put the holiness of the child on the same footing as that of the unbelieving parent; if one was baptized and the other not. But conversely, if the child of even a mixed marriage is holy, surely it is a fit subject for baptism. If St. Paul disproves the institution, he approves its principle." As against these men who admit that the practice was not in existence when Paul wrote, while yet Paul's principle justifies the practice, we simply say that the intelligence of the inspired apostle was the equal of that of any Pedobaptists. Paul surely knew the implications of his own words! If his words "disprove the practice," as these men allow, why, then, in Paul's opinion (else his belief and practice were out of harmony) his words did not carry with them an approval of infant baptism. I would rather believe in the consistency of the Apostle Paul than in that of Stanley, Neander and Gwatkin.

Again, readers of church history know that the early justification of infant baptism generally was not that the child was holy, but that it was guilty of original sin which must be washed away in baptism. We have already quoted John Wesley as giving this as his first reason in favor of infant baptism. Many Pedobaptists today thus teach. Our Roman Catholic friends do so. The Church of England Prayer Book refers to: "the baptizing of this child, who being born in original sin, and in the wrath of God, is now, by the laver of regeneration in baptism, received into the number of the children of God, and heirs of everlasting life."

These are more in harmony with the early views on the need and the benefit of infant baptism than is the statement that the principle of infant baptism is the holiness of the infant. Meyer thus decides against the right of our friends to get from Paul's words either institution or principle: "Had the baptism of Christian children been then in existence, Paul could not have drawn this inference, because in that case the [holiness] of such children would have had another basis. That the passage before us does not even contain an exegetical justification of infant baptism, is shown in the remarks on Acts 16:15. ... Neither is it the point of departure, from which, almost of necessity, pedobaptism must have developed itself. ... such a point is rather to be found in the gradual development of the doctrine of original sin(s)."--Commentary, 1 Corinthians 7:14.

BABES IN HEAVEN. A few lines may be spared for this question. Mr. Madsen criticizes us for holding that one dying in infancy is saved, while yet we do not admit it to baptism. He writes: "If the infant should die it is fit for Heaven as Christ's 'purchased possession but if it lives, it is not a proper subject for baptism into the membership of Christ's Church" (p. 60). "Is it easier for an infant to enter Heaven than to find admission into the Church? This is apparently what the Baptist position amounts to when treated by analysis" (p. 81).

We only notice this because some person might be found who would mistake pleasantry for argument. We would be glad to hear from Mr. Madsen as to whether any adults who die unbaptized will be in heaven. We shall not do him the discredit of supposing that he would give a negative reply. But, if so, Mr. Madsen could hardly recognize them as being in the Methodist Church. Shall we retort as a *reductio ad absurdum*, that it must be easier to get into Heaven than into the Methodist Church? I presume Mr. Madsen will allow that more folk will be in heaven than there are in the Methodist Church. If so, it would seem that the former place is the more easily entered. No; jests however sharp they may be, should not be put forth as arguments-especially if they are as much against your own position as that of your opponent.

01.008. A Pedobaptist Miscellany

A Pedobaptist Miscellany.

"John's baptism was essentially an act of consecration, preparatory to the kingdom, symbolizing by the immersion of the whole body the consecration of the whole man. But for all, except Christ, this consecration required repentance, and this change of mind, preceding baptism, is symbolized, not created, by going under and coming up out of the water."--E. E. Anderson, M.A. A brief mention ought to be made of certain miscellaneous arguments and statements put forth in *The Question of Baptism*, in chapters dealing with Baptist Proof-texts and Objections. We have thus to distinguish between "arguments" and "statements," for some of the latter at least would be unduly honored by the former title.

JOHNS BAPTISM. The baptism of John, which was over at the time when Jesus gave his great commission, cannot be referred to as deciding the question of the subjects of Christian baptism. But our Pedobaptists friends so often insist that the commission must be interpreted in the light of what the Jews would already know of baptism that the subjects of the earlier baptism have great importance for them. The Bible is explicit as to the people baptized by John: "Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins" (Matthew 2:5-6). The baptism was called "the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins" (Mark 1:1), manifestly because the candidates were required to repent. John Wesley's comment on "preaching the baptism of repentance" may be accepted: "That is, preaching repentance, and baptizing as a sign and means of it."

We never heard of anyone trying to get direct support for infant baptism in the New Testament statements regarding the subjects of John's baptism. Pedobaptists here seem to need all their skill for the attempt to break the force of the texts as against their position. In such an attempt Mr. Madsen has an interesting reference to John's baptism of Jesus. Every believer in Christ knows that He was sinless and so could not repent. It has often been asked, Seeing that John's was a "baptism of repentance unto remission of sins," how could the sinless One submit to the rite? In answer, we could accept two statements: the first from Mr. Madsen to the effect that "the baptism of Jesus, like his birth and death, was unique"; the second from Dummelow--"Though sinless, Jesus came to identify himself with sinners. He would be 'under the law that he might redeem those that were under the law' (Galatians 4:4-5)." But of Jesus' baptism, Mr. Madsen pens this remarkable sentence:

"No argument can be drawn from it as to the subjects of baptism, except, perhaps, that they should be sinless, and infants come close enough to that category, though Dr. Carson speaks of their 'sins' (p. 63). This is delightful. But infant baptism, as we have already noticed, was early advocated on the ground that infants, as guilty of original sin, needed remission, and John Wesley himself defended it for this reason. Such advocates did not think infants "come close enough to that category." Moreover, see how the suggestion that "perhaps" we can look upon sinlessness as a condition of baptism applies to the Methodist custom of adult baptism. The Methodist Church of

course practices believers' baptism. For instance, in the tract on Should Only Believers be Baptized? is found the following passage:

"The writer was not baptized in childhood. He was converted at the age of sixteen, and, after studying the question, was baptized as a believer by the usual Methodist practice of pouring." Was sinlessness the category here? Our friends really ought to refrain from using arguments against the position of others which would tell with equal force against their own avowed practice of believers' baptism.

THE EUNUCH.

Mr. Madsen calls attention to the fact that Acts 8:37 ("And Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus is the Son of God") is an interpolation, and is omitted from the Revised Version. We do not, and should not, use the text as if it were from the pen of the inspired historian. But this is far from saying that the passage misrepresents the facts. Many Pedobaptists writers gladly agree that Acts 8:37 is in complete harmony with what must have occurred. e.g., Dummelow's Commentary says it is "a very early and trustworthy marginal addition, which was ultimately incorporated into the text. The simplicity of the baptismal confession is a proof of its genuineness." The Expositors' Greek Testament says the words "may well have expressed what actually happened, as the question in verse 36 evidently required an answer."

We may look at the thing from another point of view. If a man as old as the eunuch must have been were to come to Mr. Madsen, of what would the latter gentleman wish to be assured? Mr. Madsen would not baptize him if he were obviously an unbeliever. The Methodist tract speaks of one; "baptized as a believer." In my copy of the Order of Administration of the Sacraments and other Services for the use of the People called Methodists, in the section dealing with the ministration of baptism to such as are of riper years, a confession of faith is demanded of the person to be baptized. Was the eunuch a believer? If so, his case may be quoted as a warrant for our practice; and if a similar warrant by way of Biblical example is given for the baptism of an infant, we shall likewise practice infant baptism. But there is no such example.

SIMON MAGUS. The record of the baptism of this man is found in Acts 8:13. The following verses tell of his subsequent terrible sin and Peter's severe rebuke of him. Mr. Madsen devotes several pages to the incident. It is frequently used as an objection to our position. Sometimes, a writer will say: Here is a case in which your adult baptism benefited little; see how after baptism a man can be "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." Again, the passage is sometimes quoted as an indisputable instance of the baptism of an unbeliever. The question is really a very simple one. Simon was either a believer in Christ, or he was not. (1) If he were a believer, then clearly our Pedobaptists friends cannot quote his case against our practice. (2) If he were not a sincere believer, how does that fact help the Pedobaptists position? The profitless baptism of an adult fraud could not by any possibility give warrant for the baptism of a babe whose holiness or whose position in the kingdom is advanced as a reason for its baptism. There is no authority for infant baptism then on either view. Moreover, how can Simon's case be more against our practice than it is against the Methodist practice of believers' baptism? In the case of adults, Methodists insist as much as we do on a confession of faith; the difference is that they ask for a longer confession. So it is clear that whether Simon were a genuine believer who soon fell into sin, or a man who was a

disbeliever from the beginning, his case would not help the Pedobaptists position.

Now, we may notice, on its merits, a remarkable statement which Mr. Madsen makes. He says of Simon: "Here we have an instance in which a notorious unbeliever received baptism in New Testament times" (p. 68). The only answer needed is given in Acts 8:13. Remember these are not Philip's words, but the words of Luke, writing many years after the event: "Simon also himself believed." Mr. Madsen's denial of the inspired historian's words will not help his cause.

THE BAPTISM OF SAUL. The paragraph in which Mr. Madsen replies to our Baptist friends may be quoted: "Acts 22:16 : 'And now, why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on His name.' Here is Saul under conviction, but not converted. We have precisely the same reason for believing that Saul had not washed his sins away, as for believing that he had not received Christian baptism, viz., the direction to do both. The presumption is that, up to this point in his experience, he had done neither. There was no proposal to delay baptism until his sins were washed away, and this material fact does not give support to the Baptist theory" (pp. 68, 69).

Presumably, the above was written as a kind of ad hominem argument. Its point is to convict some who quote Acts 22:16 as in favor of the baptism of believers of inconsistency in that they delay baptism until sins are forgiven. We must agree that Acts 22:16 is not a verse which can harmonize with the view that Saul's sins were forgiven prior to his obedience in baptism. But yet it is true that the baptism enjoined in Acts 22:16 is the baptism of a believer and of a penitent. When the Lord appeared to Saul, the persecutor was led to believe in Jesus of Nazareth as the Lord Christ. Acts 22:16 can be quoted as a proof text on our side because as a fact it does enjoin the baptism of a penitent believer in Christ. There is no such command in the New Testament for the baptism of a nonbeliever, be he adult or infant.

THE LORDS DAY.

What has the Lord's day to do with the subjects of baptism? Not very much; but our Pedobaptists friends think they can convict us of inconsistency. Mr. Madsen puts the matter thus: "The fact that infant baptism can claim a very ancient history, and the sanction of almost universal practice, is not received by the Baptists with any favor. They affirm it is based on usage alone, and not on Scripture alone and is, therefore, to be discredited. We are asked to produce a passage which commands the baptizing of infants. Here, again, we use their particular argument against their own practice. Why do they, in common with other Christians, observe the Lord's day? The Baptists set aside a positive command in Scripture to keep holy the Sabbath Day, and regard the first day of the week--Sunday--as the Christian Sabbath, and they do it on the ground of usage alone. There is no other" (pp. 73, 74).

There are two wrong things in the above paragraph: (1) the statement that we "set aside a positive command in Scripture" when we observe the Lord's day; and (2) the assertion that we have equal authority for infant baptism and the Lord's day. On the first of these, we may point out that there is not in the New Covenant a command of "Sabbath" observance. Christians are "not under the law." In the New Covenant, with a change of priesthood, there is also a change in the law (Hebrews 7:12, Cf. Colossians 2:14-16). If anybody were because of church usage to set aside God's commandments, he would be guilty of sin--whether that command had to do with Sabbath or baptism. The second point we may notice a little more fully. When Mr. Madsen declares that usage

alone is our warrant for baptism and the Lord's day, what kind of "usage" does he mean? Is he speaking of church usage in post-apostolic days? Then, it is not correct to say that this is our warrant for the Lord's day. We have the day mentioned in Revelation 1:10. We also have the statement that the disciples met "upon the first day of the week" to break bread (Acts 20:7). Does Mr. Madsen mean "usage" in the New Testament church? Then, it is not correct to say that we have such in regard to infant baptism. So either Mr. Madsen is employing the word "usage" in different senses when he speaks of having in "usage" like authority for the Lord's day and for infant baptism, or else he is making an assertion which is incorrect. In either case, his argument falls to the ground. The difference between our positions may be stated thus:

"We observe a Lord's day, and Mr. M. observes baby-baptism. He says our authority for the one is the same that he has for the other! Let us see:--1. The Lord's day is expressly mentioned in the New Testament--Baby-baptism is never mentioned therein. 2. The commemoration of the Lord's death on the first day of the week has apostolic example. Infant baptism has no Bible example at all."

If Mr. Madsen will produce warrant for infant baptism such as we have given in the above for our observance of the Lord's day, we shall be Pedobaptists within twenty-four hours of receipt of the authority.

01.009. Post-Apostolic Practice

Post-Apostolic Practice.

"The New Testament evidence, then, seems to point to the conclusion that infant baptism, to say the least, was not the general custom of the apostolic age. And now it ought to be noticed that this conclusion is greatly strengthened if we examine the light that is thrown backwards upon the age of the apostles from the post-apostolic history and literature."--J. C. Lambert, in *The Sacraments in the New Testament*.

We do not refer to the post-apostolic days as if the teaching or practice of the church then is in any way to be considered as authoritative. The New Testament must be our sole guide in matters pertaining to the ordinances of our Lord Jesus Christ. The only appeal which we can sanction is to the Word of God. We go to the Fathers for the practice of a later age; we read the Scriptures for the will of God. In the New Testament we find both commands for and instances of the baptism of believers; but there is not anywhere within its pages either example or precept concerning infant baptism, nor is there any text which necessarily implies infant baptism. That should settle the question for us. To those who regard the Scriptures as alone authoritative it would matter but little if it were proved (as of course it cannot be) that infant baptism was in existence immediately or soon after the death of the apostles.

We have already indicated that in the centuries in which our Pedobaptists friends find infant baptism there are also to be found a great many things which Protestants at least agree in rejecting. One writer has put it thus: "Romanists quote the Greek and early Roman Fathers of the first four centuries, in proof of monastic life, the celibacy of the clergy, the merit of perpetual virginity, the Pontificate of Peter in Rome, and infant communion in the Lord's Supper. Protestants quote the same authorities for infant baptism, and argue from them in the same manner as the Romanists for their traditions. But Protestants repudiate the Greek and Roman Fathers as competent and credible witnesses for infant communion, monastic life, and a bachelor priesthood: yet they quote with confidence and hear with gladness the same authors in favor of infant baptism. This we regard as an indefensible aberration from sound logic and fair play."

Mr. Madsen has a chapter on "The Practice of the Early Church," the "early church" being the church of the second and third centuries. While we do not feel bound to treat an argument drawn from extra-Scriptural sources as having any weight in the settlement of the question as to those whom the Lord wanted to be baptized, still some may be helped by an examination of the alleged proof from the post-apostolic age.

THE DIDACHE.

There is one book from which Mr. Madsen does not quote in the chapter under review. This is the "Didache," or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," which is described by Schaff as "The Oldest Church Manual." It is generally agreed by Christian scholars that it is one of our most remarkable and reliable sources of knowledge regarding the church of the sub-apostolic age. Its date is

probably from 100 to 120 A.D.; some place it earlier, and a few later; parts of it may be of a considerably later date. The "Didache" knows nothing of infant baptism. Its reference to subjects is brief: "And as regards baptism, baptize thus: having first communicated these instructions, baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in living water." Later it mentions that the candidate should fast for a day or two preciously. Pedobaptists have often sought to explain away the absence of mention of infant baptism in this book. James Heron, in *The Church of the Sub-Apostolic Age*, does it thus: "The great majority of those admitted to the Church during the period in question were adult converts from heathenism, or at least persons capable of being taught. The baptism most prominent in such circumstances will be necessarily adult baptism."

We can give a crushing reply to this argument, so often presented, in the words of a Pedobaptists scholar. J. C. Lambert (a Pedobaptists, who thinks it possible that infant baptism came in in certain places after the destruction of Jerusalem, and that it had received the sanction of the Apostle John himself) says: "If the silence of the New Testament is suggestive, much more so is the silence of the Didache. For while in the former baptism is dealt with historically and doctrinally, from the point of view of its connection with the preaching of the gospel and with faith, in the latter it is dealt with liturgically, from the point of view of its place in the order of public worship; and if infant baptism was practiced at all, it is difficult to see how it could be altogether ignored in this handbook of ritual prescriptions." The writer proceeds to reply to Dr. Schaff's endeavor to break the force of such considerations as the foregoing: "'Infant Baptism,' he says, 'has no sense, and would be worse than useless, where there is no Christian family or Christian congregation to fulfill the conditions of baptism, and to guarantee a Christian nurture.' The remark is very just in itself, but, as applied to the Didache with the view of explaining why its silence about infant baptism cannot properly be used as an argument against the apostolic origin of the practice, it seems remarkably mal a propos. Surely, towards the end of the first century (Dr. Schaff assumes the work to have been written then), and in a church which had drawn up its own Church Manual, there were Christian families and Christian congregations to guarantee the conditions of Christian nurture. And so, when we find that in this early handbook the directions for baptism take no cognizance whatever of infants, but provide for adult baptism alone, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that, at all events in that part of the Church in which the Didache circulated, infant baptism can neither have been regularly practiced nor regarded as the Apostolic rule."--*The Sacraments in the New Testament*.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

Justin wrote his Apology about 150 A.D. Mr. Madsen quotes him as saying: "Many men and women amongst us, 60 or so years old, were discipled to Christ in their childhood."

There is no mention whatever of baptism in this passage. The sole force of it lies in the words "in their childhood." J. C. Lambert declines to recognize that Justin here refers to either infant baptism or infant discipleship. He says that "in the picture which he [Justin] gives of the baptismal arrangements of the Church in his own day, infant baptism finds no place." Lambert denies that the word pais which Justin uses necessarily means an infant or even a young child. In the New Testament pais and its diminutive paidion are used of a girl twelve years of age (Mark 5:39; Mark 5:42; Luke 8:51-54). There are in Churches of Christ great numbers of people who were "discipled to Christ in their childhood" who yet received baptism as believers.

IRENIUS.

Irenius is said to have become Bishop of Gaul in 178 A.D. He is quoted by Mr. Madsen as writing of Jesus: "He came to save all persons by Himself--all I say who by Him are regenerated to God--infants, and little ones, and children, and young and old."

Baptism is not mentioned in this passage. It is believed by most Pedobaptists that this is an allusion to infant baptism, the term "regenerated" being read as implying this; but some Pedobaptists have declined to admit the necessity of the inference. Lambert, in *The Sacraments in the New Testament*, refers to this passage from Irenius as "probably the earliest reference to infant baptism," though "even here, it will be observed, baptism is not directly mentioned; so that the passage cannot be cited as an unequivocal witness for the practice of infant baptism." The allusion is doubtful, then; and, even were it indisputable, it is about three generations too late to be authoritative.

ORIGEN. This well-known Father and leader of the Alexandrian school, who lived 185-254 A.D., is appealed to by the author of *The Question of Baptism*, because he says: "The Church has received a tradition from the Apostles to give baptism to little children."

Mr. Madsen notes that a discussion has waged as to whether the parvuli of Origen would include infants. In reality, the controversy on this point is superfluous. Irrespective of this, here are the decisions of three scholars on Origen's statement.

Neander in his *Church History* writes: "Origen in whose system infant baptism could readily find its place, though not in the same connection as in the system of the North African Church, declares it to be an apostolical tradition, an expression, by the way, which cannot be regarded as of much weight in this age, when the inclination was so strong to trace every institution which was considered of special importance to the apostles; and when so many walls of separation hindering the freedom of prospect, had already been set up between this and the apostolic age."

Such a statement from a staunch Pedobaptists will keep us from saying that because Origen called child-baptism an apostolic tradition therefore that statement is to be accepted. Dr. Wilhelm Moeller, Professor Ordinarius of Church History in the University of Keil, says:

"Origen. .. makes appeal to it as to an ancient tradition. But that the universal ecclesiastical tradition was not in favor of it is shown by Tertullian's opposition to infant baptism." In similar fashion J. C. Lambent writes: "It is not till we come to a writing of Origen, which dates from the second quarter of the third century, that we find for the first time, the claim made on behalf of child baptism (parvuli, not infantes, is the word used) that it rests upon apostolic tradition. And there are two considerations which go far to qualify this claim. One is the well-known fact that by the time of Origen it had become very customary to trace back to the apostles institutions and ideas that were by no means apostolic. The other is that Origen's testimony as to the apostolic origin of child baptism is not in keeping with the attitude to the subject of his predecessor Tertullian, or with the practice of the Church, for more than a century after his own time,- indeed, right on to the days of Augustine."--*The Sacraments in the New Testament*.

TERTULLIAN.

Tertullian, of Carthage, the first of the great Latin Fathers, lived between 150 and 230 A.D. (some say 160-220). Prof. Orr and J. Vernon Bartlet date his conversion at about 190 or 192. Tertullian wrote many books and treatises, including a tractate on Baptism. Mr. Madsen devotes nearly a page to the question whether the tract on Baptism was written before or after its author's conversion to Montanism in 202. Now, Mr. Madsen knows perfectly well that the material thing is not whether Tertullian wrote a few years before or a few years after the year 200. His opposition to infant baptism may have belonged to the end of the second century or to the beginning of the third. The striking thing is that the very first writer to mention infant baptism is an opponent of it, and that his opposition to it is held by such eminent and scholarly Pedobaptists as Neander and Lambert to discountenance the claim that Origen makes that the practice was an apostolic tradition.

After quoting from Tertullian's *De Baptismo*, Mr. Madsen writes: "Tertullian would have delayed the baptism of infants until they were old enough to know Christ, notwithstanding that he recollects his Lord said, 'Forbid them not.' The Baptists, therefore, range him on their side. But Tertullian would delay the baptism of virgins and widows. Do the Baptists follow him here, and endorse his authority? At this point Tertullian's opinion is worthless. In any case, he is not with the Baptists in their practice and belief, while his testimony on infant baptism, to which he was in antagonism, proves the prevalence of the practice in the second century." The word "notwithstanding" in this passage is delicious. I presume Tertullian had read his Bible; if so, he ought to have known that the passage in which Jesus said, "Forbid them not," said not a word about baptism. Again, the question, "Do the Baptists follow him" in postponement of baptism of widows? is a most ingenious way of distracting attention from the issue. Baptists and members of Churches of Christ do not need to "follow" Tertullian in their practice. For the baptism of believers we have abundant New Testament authority. It is the Pedobaptists controversialist who, destitute of proof of infant baptism in the Scriptures, needs to drag in an argument from post-apostolic practice. Why we refer to Tertullian is, not to use him as authority for our position, but to show that the great African leader and very first writer to deal expressly with the subject of infant baptism opposes the very thing for support of which Pedobaptists champions appeal to the Fathers.

Mr. Madsen began his treatment of Tertullian thus: "Neander remarks, 'in the last years of the second century, Tertullian appears as a zealous opponent of infant baptism.'" We do not see how we can do better than continue the quotation thus happily begun. The famous church historian and Pedobaptists scholar wrote: "Immediately after Iren^{us}, in the last years of the second century, Tertullian appears as a zealous opponent of infant baptism; a proof that the practice had not as yet come to be regarded as an apostolical institution; for otherwise he would hardly have ventured to express himself so strongly against it. We perceive from his argument against infant baptism that its advocates already appealed to Matthew 19:14, a passage which it would be natural for every one to apply in this manner. 'Our Lord rebuked not the little children, but commanded them to be brought to him that he might bless them.' Tertullian advises, that in consideration of the great importance of the transaction, and of the preparation necessary to be made for it on the part of the recipients, baptism as a general thing should rather be delayed than prematurely applied, and he takes this occasion to declare himself particularly opposed to haste in the baptism of children. In answer to the objection drawn from those words of Christ, he replies: 'Let them come while they are growing up; let them come while they are learning, while they are taught to what it is they are coming; let them become Christians when they are susceptible of the knowledge of Christ. What

haste, to procure the forgiveness of sins for the age of innocence! We show more prudence in the management of our worldly concerns, than we do in entrusting the divine treasure to those who cannot be entrusted with earthly property. Let them first learn to feel their need of salvation; so it may appear that we have given to those that wanted.' Tertullian evidently means, that children should be led to Christ by instructing them in Christianity; but that they should not receive baptism until, after having been sufficiently instructed, they are led from personal conviction and by their own free choice, to seek for it with sincere longing of the heart. It may be said, indeed, that he is only speaking of the course to be followed according to the general rule; whenever there was momentary danger of death, baptism might be administered, even according to his views. But if he had considered this to be so necessary, he could not have failed to mention it expressly. It seems, in fact, according to the principles laid down by him, that he could not conceive of any efficacy whatever residing in baptism, without the conscious participation and individual faith of the person baptized; nor could he see any danger accruing to the age of innocence from delaying it; although this view of the matter was not logically consistent with his own system."--Neander's Church History, T. & T. Clark's Edition, Vol. I., pp. 425, 426.

We give this long quotation in fairness to Neander and to Tertullian. It contains much which modern Pedobaptists might read with benefit, and furnishes a wholesome corrective of what less famous advocates of infant baptism than Neander have sought to say regarding Tertullian's position.

CYPRIAN. The conversion of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, is dated at about 245 A.D., and his martyrdom at 258. A bishop Fidus submitted a question to a council at Carthage, in which he asked whether a child should be baptized very soon after its birth, or not till eight days after, as in the case of circumcision. Fidus favored the latter view. Cyprian and his colleagues, to the number of sixty-six, sent a reply to Fidus in which the following passages occurred: "In this course which you thought was to be taken, no one agreed; but we all rather judge that the mercy and grace of God is not to be refused to any one born of man. For as the Lord says in his Gospel, 'The Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them,' as far as we can, we must strive that, if possible, no soul be lost."--Cyprian's Works, in T. & T. Clark's Ante-Nicene Library.

"But again, if even to the greatest sinners, and to those who had sinned much against God, when they subsequently believed, remission of sins is granted--and nobody is hindered from baptism and from grace--how much rather ought we to shrink from hindering an infant who, being lately born, has not sinned, except in that, being born after the flesh according to Adam, he has contracted the contagion of the ancient death at its earliest birth, who approaches the more easily on this very account, to the reception of the forgiveness of sins--that to him are remitted, not his own sins, but the sins of another."--Ibid.

Only two things need to be said of Cyprian's position. The first is that his letter is a century and a half too late for it to have any weight as to the rightfulness of infant baptism. What matters it whether Fidus be supported in his view that each of us would shrink from bestowing the baptismal kiss on "such an object" as a new-born babe, or whether we magnanimously declare with Cyprian that "none of us ought to revolt at that which God has condescended to create," and "although the child be but just born, yet it is no such object that any one ought to demur at kissing to impart the divine grace and the salutation of peace"? In any case, we prefer first century and apostolic

authority to third century practice. In the second place, we call attention to the view of Cyprian that the infant would receive remission of sin (original sin) in baptism.

Origen, who claimed that child-baptism was an apostolical tradition, is quoted by Mr. Madsen as saying: "Because by the sacrament of baptism, the corruption of their birth is removed, infants are baptized." Of Origen, Harnack says: "It was easy for Origen to justify child baptism, as he recognized something sinful in corporeal birth itself, and believed in sin which had been committed in a former life. The earliest justification of child baptism may therefore be traced back to a philosophical doctrine."

Neander may be quoted again: "But when now, on the one hand, the doctrine of the corruption and guilt, cleaving to human nature in consequence of the first transgression, was reduced to a more precise and systematic form, and on the other, from the want of duly distinguishing between what is outward and what is inward in baptism (the baptism by water and the baptism by the Spirit), the error became more firmly established, that without external baptism no one could be delivered from that inherent guilt, could be saved from the everlasting punishment that threatened him, or raised to eternal life; and when the notion of a magical influence, a charm connected with the sacraments continually gained ground, the theory was finally evolved of the unconditional necessity of infant baptism. About the middle of the third century, this theory was already generally admitted in the North African Church."--Church History, I.; pp. 426, 427.

Now, if we cannot get infant baptism mentioned till several generations after the apostolic age, and if when it is first mentioned the defenders of it insisted on it as a means of ensuring to the infant forgiveness of sin, are Pedobaptists of Mr. Madsen's persuasion who quote Origen and Cyprian advancing a very cogent argument? I can understand John Wesley being enamored of the early defenders of infant baptism, for the founder of Methodism argued for the practice because infants were guilty of original sin which needed to be washed away in baptism. So, today, the Romish Church, and the Church of England, in their authorized works similarly associate baptism, even infant baptism, with forgiveness. But Mr. Madsen argues for baby-baptism because the babies are holy; and he thinks he can quote Origen and Cyprian as witnesses to the practice while yet rejecting their doctrine. He tries to twit the Baptists by saying that for the first three centuries no one opposed infant baptism on modern Baptist principles. We reflect that Mr. Madsen cannot get mention of infant baptism till the end of the second century; and that no one of his authorities advocates it on modern Methodist principles as enunciated by the author of *The Question of Baptism*.

"A HISTORICAL FACT." An attempt is frequently made by Pedobaptists controversialists to help their cause by the argument that there is no record for centuries of the child of Christian parents being baptized in adult years. A similar argument has sometimes been applied to the Scriptures. When we say, Give us a case of or precept enjoining infant baptism in the New Testament, the Pedobaptists retort occasionally is, Do you give us a case of the baptism in later age of the son or daughter of Christian parents. Our friends seem consistently to forget that the real issue between us is as to whether we shall be content to do that for which we have specific authority; or whether we shall in addition do that for which there is no such explicit authority. We know we are doing the Lord's will in baptizing penitent believers, because God has asked this; but we cannot by any possibility without a special revelation know we are doing God's will in baptizing a baby--whether

on the ground of holiness, or sinfulness--because there is no syllable in the Bible to show that the Lord ever asked it. With regard to the later centuries, every reader of church history must know that there was very frequent delay of baptism, both of those whose parents were Christians and of those who from heathenism were brought to belief in Christ. Here are a few of many statements of eminent Pedobaptists.

We first cite Neander: "But if the necessity of infant baptism was acknowledged in theory, it was still far from being uniformly recognized in practice. Nor was it always from the purest motives that men were induced to put off their baptism."

"Infant baptism was not universally adopted by believers. For not only was the example of Constantine the Great, who postponed his baptism till near death, undoubtedly fashionable and not only did many who were within the close range of Christian influence delay the decisive step, but there is reason to suppose that many baptized Christians did not in the 4th cent. push forward the baptism of their children.--H. G. WOOD, in Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.

Cheetham, in his Church History, dealing with the period from 313 to 590 A.D., says: "A great hindrance to the baptism of infants was the desire to reserve for a later age the sacrament which might (it was thought) wash away the sins of the previous life."

Schaff, writing of the same period, says: "But notwithstanding this general admission of infant baptism, the practice of it was by no means universal. Forced baptism, which is contrary to the nature of Christianity and the sacrament, was as yet unknown. Many Christian parents postponed the baptism of their children, sometimes from indifference, sometimes from fear that they might by their later life forfeit the grace of baptism, and thereby make their condition the worse."

If the foregoing historians are correct as to their statement of a frequent postponement--and Mr. Madsen dare not challenge the correctness of their declaration,--then at once it is seen to be a trivial question whether we can give the name of one child of Christian parents who was baptized in adolescence or maturity.

We give a quotation from The Question of Baptism, under the heading of "A Historical Fact": "Dr. Halley, however, has an interesting historical fact for the Baptists to debate. They claim that Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, Augustine, and several others, all had 'Christian' parentage, and yet were not baptized in infancy. But Dr. Halley contends that there is no record of a child, whose parents were baptized Christians at his birth, allowed to pass infancy without baptism during the first thousand years A.D."--Page 95.

Again:--

"Dr. Halley, after reviewing the alleged evidence, demands: 'Show me the unbaptized man, or woman, boy or girl, born of baptized parents.' 'Christian' parentage is alleged by the Baptists, which is not the point in dispute, for it is evident that parents may become Christian when their children are in their teens. Our position is--were these parents 'baptized Christians' when their children were born' And we say they were not, or what amounts to the same thing there is no credible evidence that they were."--p. 96.

We call attention, in the first place, to the ingenious way in which Mr. Madsen says that the Baptists claim that Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen and Augustine are eligible to be

quoted in this connection. If "the Baptists" "claim" this, then they are in such good Pedobaptists company that their natural regret at being the subjects of Mr. Madsen's disapproval will somewhat be mitigated. In his *Christian Institutions*, Dean Stanley says: "Even amongst Christian households the instances of Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Ephrem of Edessa. Augustine, Ambrose, are decisive proofs that it was not only not obligatory, but not usual. All these distinguished persons had Christian parents, and yet were not baptized till they reached maturity."

Baptists claim! We may not agree with Stannley; but his was not a Baptist claim. He was a Church of England scholar of such attainments and recognized ability that it might not be impossible to find some who would on a priori grounds think that, if A. Stanley and A. Madsen could not both be right, it was not likely that Stanley would be the one to be wrong. No one will accuse F. W. Farrar of ignorant championship of a Baptist claim. In his *Lives of the Fathers*, Farrar writes: "Gregory of Nazianzus was born about the year 330, five years after his father's baptism. Nonna had wished for a boy, and vowed that if a son were born to her she would devote him to God; in other words, have him trained to be a presbyter. When her prayer was fulfilled she took the child in her arms to the church, and consecrated his little hands by laying them on the sacred book." Of the delay in Gregory's baptism, Farrar says: "It was the unscriptural custom of the fourth century to delay baptism till ripe age, sometimes even, as in the case of Constantine, till the deathbed, because the risk of dying unbaptized seemed smaller than the risk of falling into mortal sin after baptism. It seemed quite right both to Gregory and to his pious parents to have postponed his baptism; and yet he had such strange thoughts of God as to imagine that though he had lived from childhood a pure and holy life he would be eternally lost merely for lack of the external ceremony."

H. E. Wood writes: "Gregory of Nazianzus, whose parents were both Christians, was not baptized till he was come to years of discretion. . . The same was true of Ephraim Syrus, . . . and probably of Basil the Great."-- *Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*.

Schaff says: "Even after Constantine, there were examples of eminent teachers, as Gregory Nazianzen, Augustine, Chrysostom, who were not baptized before their conversion in early manhood, although they had Christian mothers."

Moeller refers to Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Jerome and Augustine, in similar fashion. The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia could be quoted as proving delay in the case of Basil and Gregory Nazianzen. Canon Venables in Murray's *Dictionary of Christian Biography* wrote of Basil the great: "His parents were members of noble and wealthy families and Christians by descent." "The date of Basil's baptism is uncertain, but, according to the prevalent custom, it was almost certainly delayed, until he reached man's estate." Of Chrysostom, Venables said that he was baptized at the age of twenty-three years, although he was the child of Christian parents, his mother being left a widow when he was an infant.

We can truly say that, in so far as the question of the rightful subjects of baptism is concerned, we do not care twopence whether or not Basil, Gregory, Chrysostom, and Ambrose, were or were not sons of Christian parents or baptized at maturity. Our authority for the baptism of believers would still be the Word of God; and the weakness of pedobaptism would still be that claims to do a thing in the name of the Lord for which no example or precept can be adduced in the Scriptures given for the very purpose of making us wise unto salvation. We have only noticed the men referred to because we are concerned with truth, and we want folk to see to what extremities that man is

reduced who will pen a page and a half against what he says "the Baptists" claim; whereas we have quoted not from ignorant immersionists but from some of the most scholarly men who have advocated infant baptism and who yet have made the same claim.

There is one thing, however, yet to be noted. Mr. Madsen's challenge was that the parents were not "'baptized Christians' when their children were born." Five times in the course of one paragraph does Mr. Madsen insist on this point, that the parents be shown to be Christians at the birth of the child concerned. Some of our previous quotations bear on this very point. But in addition we wish to call attention to the fact that Mr. Madsen's objection here has no bearing at all on the controversy between Victorian Methodists and either Baptists or ourselves with reference to the subjects of baptism. Look at the matter a little. Is the principle in the case of a child before whose birth the parents were "baptized Christians" a different one from that in the case of one who is an infant at the time of its parents' conversion? No. Do Methodists baptize only the babies of those whose parents were "'baptized Christians' when their children were born"? No; they never suggest such a thing. Why "parents" rather than "parent"? Does Mr. Madsen believe that both parents must be Christians in order to the baptism of a child? No; he denies this. Again, when Mr. Madsen and his Tasmanian fellow-defender of infant baptism, Mr. Delbridge, quoted "to your children" in Acts 2:39 as showing that the children should be baptized, did they then lead us to understand that the "children" eligible should be children born after, not before, the Christian baptism of the parents? By no means; such parents would have been hard to get on Pentecost, on the first day on which the apostles acted on the instructions of what Mr. Madsen calls "the baptizing commission." "Baptized Christians at his birth" then, does not touch the point; it does not help the Pedobaptists argument. Why, then, is it used? Chiefly because of a pleasant if fictitious fancy that it may embarrass the other side, or possibly in order to get the unwary to think that at last in *The Question of Baptism* there is a forceful argument in favor of what we have shown to be an unscriptural position.

01.010. The Action of Baptism

The Action of Baptism.

"For the first thirteen centuries the almost universal practice of Baptism was that of which we read in the New Testament, and which is the very meaning of the word 'baptize'--that those who were baptized were plunged, submerged, immersed, into the water."--DEAN Stanley, in Christian Institutions.

"Without doubt the perfect idea of baptism is realized when one who has come to the years of discretion makes himself his own profession of faith in the Lord, knowing what he has done and having counted the cost, and then is immersed in the waters of baptism."--JOHN Watson ("Ian Maclaren"), in The Doctrines of Grace. The only reason why any believer in Christ should wish to submit to baptism is that the Lord Jesus commanded it. Save as an act of obedience and surrender to the authority of Christ, the act is unmeaning. It is because this element of obedience comes in that we plead for the immersion of penitent believers. We ought to let the Lord decide as to what he wishes us to do. If he commanded sprinkling or pouring, then we wish to have water poured or sprinkled upon us. Our immersion will not do, if the Lord commanded something which is not immersion. Similarly, if our Saviour asked for immersion, we shall not say that sprinkling or pouring will do as well; for, just as pouring is different from sprinkling, so are sprinkling and pouring both different from immersion. The foregoing words may show how unfair it is for Mr. Madsen to write that "the amount of water to be used in baptism is essentially the basis of the controversy." This is by no means the case. If sprinkling is baptism, we do not care whether Mr. Madsen sprinkles ten drops of water or a billion drops. If pouring is baptism, he may pour a cupful or a bucketful. If immersion is baptism, we care not whether the immersion takes place in a baptistery, a pond, a river, a lake, or an ocean. What we ask is that in each case the thing be done which the Lord asked to be done.

We wish to call attention to the fact that no one denies that the person who is immersed is baptized. No debate takes place on this question. Mr. Madsen admits that "baptism may be validly administered by immersion." Ministers of nearly all the churches which practice sprinkling will on occasion immerse rather than lose their flock. The Anglican Church has more than sanctioned immersion, for its Prayer Book explicitly states that the priest shall take the child (if it may well endure it) and "dip it in the water, discreetly and warily." The recent erection of a baptistery in St. Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne, witnesses to the belief of a great church in immersion. The only disputed question is as to whether sprinkling or pouring are also baptism. Many Pedobaptists, as Dean Stanley, who admit that immersion was the primitive church custom, justify departure therefrom on the grounds of expediency, as in cold climates, and of propriety. Some, as Mr. Madsen, believe that from the beginning sprinkling and pouring were to be found.

We may say that when a scholar reading the classical writings of Greece, comes across the word transliterated in the New Testament "baptize," he never translates it by "sprinkle" or "pour." The Greeks had a word which specifically meant "sprinkle" (rantizo, see Hebrews 9:13; Hebrews 9:19;

Hebrews 9:21; Lev, 6:27, etc., Septuagint). They possessed a word meaning "pouf" (cheo, Ezekiel 20:33-34, etc., Sept.; ek-cheo, "pour out," occurs in Acts 2:17-18; Revelation 16:1-4; Revelation 16:6; Revelation 16:8; Revelation 16:10; Revelation 16:12; Revelation 16:17). Not once is baptizo translated by "sprinkle" or "pour," and never is either cheo or rantizo used of the ordinance of baptism.

LEXICONS.

Greek lexicons agree that the primary meaning of baptizo is to dip, immerse, plunge, submerge. In the figurative uses of the word given in the lexicons, dip is the basis of the figure. Not one is quoted by our Pedobaptists friends which gives "sprinkle" or "pour" as either a primary or secondary meaning. We quote from a few lexicons.

LIDDELL & SCOTT.--I. To dip in or under water. Of ships, to sink them. Passive, to bathe. Metaphorically: soaked in wine, over head and ears in debt; drowned with questions. II. To draw wine from bowls in cups (of course by dipping them). III. to baptize, N.T., Eccl.

DONNEGAN.--To immerse repeatedly into a liquid; to submerge, sink (ships).

SOPHOCLES.--To dip, to immerse; to sink. Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (146 B.C. to 1100 A.D.).

MALTBY (Bishop of Durham).--To plunge; to immerse.

SCHREVELIUS.--To baptize, dip, immerse, wash, cleanse.

BAGSTER.--"Pr. to dip, immerse; to cleanse or purify by washing; to administer the rite of baptism; to baptize."

CREMER.--baptizo, "to immerse, to submerge." He says: "The peculiar N.T. and Christian use of the word to denote immersion, submersion for a religious purpose--to baptize, John 1:25. .. may be pretty clearly traced back to the Levitical washings" (Leviticus 14:8-9, etc.). On p. 46 of The Question of Baptism, Mr. Madsen referred to "'the very highest authority on Greek and Greek usage'--Grimm's Wilke's Lexicon of N.T. Greek." I very much regret that by a singular omission this "very highest authority" is not directly quoted from in the chapter in which

Mr. Madsen seeks to instruct his brethren as to the Scriptural "Mode of Baptism." Mr. Madsen summarizes Bannerman's summary of lexicons, and says: "Grimm does not give 'immersion' as one of the meanings at all. The word he translates as immersion is 'baptisma.'"--p. 101.

Now it is true that Grimm translates baptisma as "immersion." When we remember that baptisma is used in Romans 6:4; Ephesians 4:5; 1 Peter 2:21, of the ordinance of Christian baptism, the careful reader will be at no loss to understand to what extent Mr. Madsen helps the cause of sprinkling or pouring by quoting Grimm as translating baptisma by "immersion." We give a statement as to Grimm's treatment of baptizo.

Grimm'S Lexicon (edited by Thayer)--I. 1. Prop., to dip repeatedly, to immerge, submerge. 2. to cleanse by dipping, wash, bathe. 3. Metaphorically, to overwhelm." II. In the N.T. it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution, first instituted by John the Baptist, afterwards by christ's command received by christians and adjusted to the contents and nature of their religion, viz., an

immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin, and administered to those who, impelled by a desire for salvation, sought admission to the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom."

BULLINGER.—Baptizo (in form a frequentative of bapto, dip or dye). Baptizo to make a thing dipped or dyed. To immerse for a religious purpose, may be traced back to the Levitical washings, see Leviticus 14:8-9, etc. (out of which arose the baptism of proselytes), which were connected with the purification which followed on and completed the expiation from sin."

We give also some quotations from well-known Pedobaptists authorities—dictionary writers, historians, etc.

DICTIONARIES AND ENCYCLOPEDIAS.

Hastings' Dictionary of the BIBLE.--The rite is nowhere described in detail; but the element was always water, and the mode of using it was commonly immersion. The symbolism of the ordinance required this. It was an act of purification and hence the need of water. A death to sin was expressed by the plunge beneath the water, and a rising again to a life of righteousness by the return to light and air; and hence the appropriateness of immersion."-- Article on "Baptism," by A. Plummer. IBID.--"The ritual of baptism consisted of an immersion of the baptized person in water (Matthew 3:16, Mark 1:10, Acts 8:38)."--Article on "Church," by S. C. Gayford.

Hastings' encyclopedia of religion and ethics.-- "Immersion seems to have been the practice of the Apostolic age; in continuity with Jewish proselyte baptism; and it is implied in Paul's language, especially in his figure of baptism as spiritual burial and resurrection (Romans 6:3-5, Colossians 2:12). But the form was not held essential; and when conditions presented practical difficulties--whether local, climatic, or due to physical weakness-- it came to be modified (cf. Didache, 7). The most usual form, of which we have evidence from the 2nd. cent. onwards, as regards adults, was that of standing semi-immersed in water, up to knees or waist, combined with threefold pouring over the head (triune affusion)," "Baptism," by J. V. Bartlet.

We call attention to the apostolic practice of the first sentence, and the later modifications thereof referred to in the last two sentences.

HASTINGS' DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS.--Baptism: "A rite wherein by immersion in water the participant symbolizes and signalizes his transition from an impure to a pure life, his death to a past he abandons, and his new birth to a future he desires." "That the normal mode was by immersion of the whole body may be inferred from the meaning of baptizo, which is the intensive or frequentative form of bapto, 'I dip,' and denotes to immerse or submerge. --Article by the late Marcus Dods.

There are no works of reference in more common use or in higher esteem than these three. The fact that the writers of the articles were Pedobaptists gives force to their admissions.

PROTESTANT DICTIONARY.--"Baptism.--This word is Greek, and signifies prop. dipping, a ceremonial washing with water, and is the name of one of the two sacraments ordained by Christ."

CATHOLIC DICTIONARY.--"In Apostolic times the body of the baptized person was immersed, for St. Paul looks on this immersion as typifying burial with Christ, and speaks of baptism as a bath."

CHURCH HISTORIANS, ETC.

MOSHEIM.--"In this century [i.e., the first century] baptism was administered in convenient places not in the public assemblies, and by immersing the candidates wholly in water."

NEANDER.--"The usual form of submersion at baptism, practiced by the Jews, was transferred to the Gentile Christians. Indeed, this form was the most suitable to signify that which Christ intended to render in object of contemplation by such a symbol; the immersion of the whole man in the spirit of a new life"--History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles.

KURTZ.--"Baptism was administered by complete immersion (Acts 8:38) in the name of Christ or of the Trinity (Matthew 28:19)."

SCHAFF.--"The usual form of baptism was immersion. This is inferred from the original meaning of the Greek baptizein and baptismos; from the analogy of John's baptism in the Jordan; from the apostles' comparison of the sacred rite with the miraculous passage of the Red Sea, with the escape of the ark from the flood, with a cleansing and refreshing bath, and with burial and resurrection; finally, from the general custom of the ancient church, which prevails in the East to this day."--History of the Church: Apostolic Christianity, A.D. 1-100.

GWATKIN.--"Immersion was the rule. The Jews were very strict, holding that even a ring on a woman's finger prevented complete immersion; and though the Christians were not likely to be so pedantic, the whole symbolism of Baptism requires immersion, and so St. Paul explains it" (Romans 6:3-5).--Early Church History to A.D. 313.

FISHER.--"The ordinary mode of baptism was by immersion."--The History of the Church, Period I., "The Apostolic Age."

DOLLINGER.--"At first Christian Baptism commonly took place in the Jordan; of course as the Church spread more widely, in private houses also. Like that of St. John, it was by immersion of the whole person, which is the only meaning of the New Testament word. A mere pouring or sprinkling was never thought of. St. Paul made this immersion a symbol of burial with Christ, and the emerging a sign of resurrection with him to a new life: Baptism is a 'bath.' Of the Ethiopian's baptism it is said, that both he and Philip went down into the water and so the Evangelist baptized him."

ROBERTSON.--"Baptism was administered by immersion, except in cases of sickness, where affusion or sprinkling was used"--History of the Christian Church, Book I., 64-313 A.D.

BINGHAM refers to immersion or dipping as "the original apostolical practice," and quotes Romans 6:4. and Colossians 2:12 as passages "which plainly refer to this custom."--Antiquities of the Christian Church.

HARNACK.--"The ceremony of the individual's immersion and emergence from the water served as a guarantee that old things were now washed away and gone, leaving him a new man.--The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries.

LAMBERT does not think "that the mode was ever treated as an absolute ceremonial necessity which could yield neither to time, place, nor circumstances," yet has the following: "The view that

immersion was the original mode of baptism finds a very strong support in a figure which Paul uses both in Romans and Colossians in connection with a doctrinal reference to the sacrament (Romans 6:3-5; Colossians 2:12). He speaks of baptism as a burial with Christ into death, and a rising again with him from the grave. Undoubtedly this shows that immersion was the usual mode of administering the rite as known to Paul."--The Sacraments in the New Testament.

ALLEN.--"The rite of baptism has undergone many changes in the lapse of time; immersion which was the prevailing mode in the ancient church, has given place to sprinkling or pouring."--Christian Institutions.

MC GIFFERT.--"The ordinary mode of baptism in the apostolic age was immersion."--History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age.

E. TYRRELL GREEN.--"It is probable that S. John the Baptist immersed in Jordan those who came to him for baptism, and immersion of converts was, so far as we can gather, the regular practice of the Church in Apostolic times. The example of the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch by Philip the deacon would seem to be a clear case in point. There can be no doubt, too, that baptism by immersion was the normal practice of the Primitive Church."-- The Church of Christ.

SECONDARY MEANING OF "BAPTIZO."

It will be noticed that lexicons from which we have quoted give various secondary meanings of baptizo, as to sink (ships), and to draw (wine). Liddell & Scott refer to its metaphorical usage by persons soaked in wine, over head and ears in debt, drowned with questions. Grimm adds to overwhelm.

Now, accepting all these secondary meanings, who is there so dull that he cannot see that not one of them is out of harmony with "dip," "immerse," "submerge," which the lexicons give as the primary meaning? And not one of them could ever have been the secondary meaning of a word meaning "sprinkle" or "pour." Mr. Madsen quotes Axtell as saying: "The drinking of wine, the buying of goods which brings debt upon one, the listening to hard questions, and such acts have no likeness to the act of dipping." When the Greeks used baptizo in connection with such things, it was never when the wine, the debts, or the questions were present in such scanty quantities as is the water at a Methodist "christening." There was a superabundance of wine, debt or questioning. In each case the man was metaphorically "overwhelmed." As Liddell & Scott say, he was 'soaked in wine,' drowned with questions, over head and ears in debt. So it is with all the other secondary meanings. If baptizo be used in the sense of to draw wine from bowls in cups, then Liddell & Scott carefully explain that this was "of course by dipping them."

Consider this word from The Question of Baptism:

"Through 30 pages Dr. Axtell expounds and illustrates the usage of the word in Scripture and classical literature, and maintains:--(i) That baptizo, when used to express the idea of putting an object into a liquid meant not simply to dip, but to sink or drown."

Neither Axtell nor Madsen could prove that to save themselves from the penalty of baptism or drowning. But now let us ask, How could baptizo come to be used of the sinking of ships? What do ships do when they sink? Do they suffer the sprinkling of rain upon their decks in some way comparable to the sprinkling which Pedobaptists administer to infants? Or is it not the case that we

say ships sink when they so go under the water as to be immersed or submerged?

About that drowning (which no lexicon that I have seen gives as a literal meaning of baptizo) Even if we were to accept the rendering, how would that favor a controversialist who is desperately anxious to prove sprinkling or pouring as valid baptism? If immersion be prolonged for a few minutes, the result may be drowning; there is thus no violent breach between the primary and this alleged meaning of baptizo. But suppose sprinkling were continued upon one--the quantity and rate of, say, Methodist sprinkling being maintained--what would be the result in that case? The poor man might die of cold, of exposure, of starvation, of old age, or even of ennui; but I venture to say that the last thing we could expect him to die of would be drowning. This is perhaps enough on this part. of the question, until Mr. Madsen will produce the reputable lexicons which tell us that baptizo means to drown. We would have thought that Josephus, who lived from 37 to 95 A.D., and who wrote in Greek, might have understood the Greek language and its meaning as well as Axtell. Josephus wrote of the murder of Aristobulus: "Continually pressing down and immersing [baptizing] him while swimming, as if in sport, they did not desist till they had entirely suffocated him."--Antiquities XV., 3, 3.

Again:--

"The child was sent by night to Jericho, and was there dipped [baptized] by the Galls, at Herod's command, in a pool till he was drowned."--Wars XXII., 22, 2. That was no sprinkling, though Josephus calls it a baptizing. These passages also prove that while yet the drowning came as a result of the baptizing, the word baptizo did not for Josephus mean "drown." No one speaks of drowning a person till he is drowned or suffocated.

We are not sure whether amazement or amusement will predominate in the case of those who witness the extraordinary defenses of their position which men will put forth in their hour of need. We have just noted the attempt to get baptizo mean to drown, though how that would benefit anybody whose only warrant for the ordinance is the commission, which includes the word baptizo, is not very clear. The Spectator, the organ, of the Methodist Church in Victoria, in its issue of October 25, 1912, has the yet more audacious statement:--"Most of the authorities hold that to immerse is to drown."

We have asked for the authority which proves that the Greek word baptizo means "to drown." Now, we shall request that some authority--other than The Spectator,--be given for the position that "to immerse is to drown." Our friends need not give us "most of the authorities"; one will do to begin with. Some folk believe that the immersion of hundreds of people during the Scoville mission was not unconnected with the concern now manifested in Pedobaptists ranks. We are glad to reassure the editor of The Spectator by saying that no homicide was committed by any baptizer; not one of the hundreds immersed was drowned. John Wesley wrote on Romans 6:4. "We are buried with him.--Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." It is pathetic to consider what nonsense Dr. Axtell, Mr. Madsen and The Spectator (who between them declare that both "baptize" and "immerse" mean "drown") would make the honored founder of Methodism write. Yet, I am loth to believe that John Wesley meant (nay, at the risk of rashness I shall confidently declare he did not mean) "the ancient manner of drowning by drowning." In several places Mr. Madsen refers to the admission of Dr. Carson, who pleaded that baptizo "always signifies to dip," that all the commentators and lexicographers were against him in this opinion. We

would call attention to the fact that Carson appealed to the lexicons as supporting his contention with reference to the primary meaning. He said: "I should consider it the most unreasonable skepticism, to deny that a word has a meaning, which all lexicons give as its primary meaning. On this point, I have no quarrel with the lexicons. There is the most complete harmony among them, in representing dip as the primary meaning of bapto and baptize." But Carson denied that the lexicographers made out their case so far as the alleged secondary meanings were concerned. In our treatment, we have not entered into this question; supposing the secondary meanings to be granted, it is still true that dip, and not sprinkle or pour, is at the basis of all the secondary and figurative meanings. No lexicon is quoted by our Pedobaptists friends as giving either "sprinkle" or "pour" even as a secondary meaning. Why we take the trouble to mention this matter at all is that Mr. Madsen harps on all the lexicons being admittedly against Dr. Carson to such an extent that the unwary reader who does not know a word of Greek might suppose that our Methodist friend had got an admission from a Baptist author that the lexicons somehow favored pouring or sprinkling; than which nothing could be more unfounded.

LUTHER AND CALVIN.

We revere the names of these men, but cannot recognize their authority. Our Lord's command remains the same, whatever Calvin and Luther said of it. In the statement of Dr. Antell's position (which the author of *The Question of Baptism*; evidently adopts, else his elaborate summary is superfluous) is the following: "The Bible doctrine and mode were restored at the Reformation. Luther favored sprinkling. Calvin preferred pouring."--p. 118.

Axtell is quoted by Mr. Madsen as holding that in the centuries after the apostolic age, an unscriptural mode, viz., dipping, became the general rule. The fact that all the church historians already quoted are against him on this point of course matters not to this Pedobaptists apologist. As to the rest of the above paragraph concerning the Reformation and the reformers, we invite a reading of the following from Dr. Philip Schaff, at once one of the most strenuous Pedobaptists advocates and a leading church historian: "The mode of baptism was no point of dispute between Anabaptists and Pedobaptists in the sixteenth century. The Roman Church provides for immersion and pouring as equally valid. Luther preferred immersion, and prescribed it in his baptismal service. In England immersion was the normal mode down to the middle of the seventeenth century."--Schaff's *History of the Church*; "Swiss Reformation," Vol. I., p. 8. In a footnote, Schaff says:--"Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth were immersed, according to the rubric of the English Prayer Book. Erasmus says, 'With us' (on the Continent) 'infants have the water poured on them; in England they are dipped.'"

Schaff quotes Luther's own words when he wishes to set forth Luther's doctrine, a practice I would venture to commend to the author of *The Question of Baptism*, when a second edition is contemplated. "'Baptism,' he says, 'is that dipping into water whence it takes its name. For, in Greek to baptize signifies to dip, and baptism is a dipping.' 'Baptism signifies two things,--death and resurrection, that is, full and complete justification. When the minister dips the child into the water, this signifies death; when he draws him out again, this signifies life. Thus Paul explains the matter (Romans 6:4). .. I could wish that the baptized should be totally immersed, according to the meaning of the word and the signification of the mystery; not that I think it necessary to do so, but that it would be well that so complete and perfect a thing as baptism should also be completely

and perfectly expressed in the sign."--Reformation, A.D. 1517-1530, I., pp. 218, 219. In Wace and Buchheim's translation of "On the Babylonish Captivity of the Church," in their book *First Principles of the Reformation*, the closing sentence given by Schaff is rendered thus: "it would be well that so complete and perfect a thing as baptism should have its sign also in completeness and perfection, even as it was doubtless instituted by Christ." We leave the unprejudiced reader to form his own conclusion as to whether the position of the greatest of the reformers is adequately represented in the three words given to it in Mr. Madsen's book: "Luther favored sprinkling."

Schaff refers to and quotes from John Calvin: "Calvin regarded immersion as the primitive form of baptism, but pouring or sprinkling as equally valid." "He says, *Instit. IV. ch. xv., Sec. 19*: 'Whether the person who is baptized be wholly immersed, and whether thrice or once, or whether water be only poured or sprinkled upon him, is of no importance; churches ought to be left at liberty in this respect to act according to the difference of countries. The very word baptize, however, signifies to immerse; and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church.'"--"Swiss Reformation," II., p. 373.

John Calvin was a great and learned man, and we would rather listen to him than to some modern Pedobaptists; but yet he was not a great enough man for us to follow when he calmly says it "is of no importance" whether or not we adhere to what was the primitive practice and the very meaning of the word given by our Lord.

NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING.

Doctrines of men may interest us, views of great reformers may well merit attention, and statements of church historians as to postapostolic practice may not be unimportant; but after all the believer in Jesus Christ will seek for guidance as to the action of baptism in the Scriptures. He will want to know whether the dipping, immersion, submersion, which lexicons agree to be the primary meaning of the word baptizo are in harmony with the New Testament teaching and practice. Such a reader will soon find that there is complete harmony here.

The Baptism of John.

We may appropriately begin with the baptism of Jesus, our great Exemplar. In Mark 1:9, we are told Jesus "was baptized of John in the Jordan." Matthew 3:16 and Mark 1:10 represent the Saviour after baptism as "coming up out of the water." The Greek preposition in Mark 1:9 (see R.V., margin) is "into"; Mark says the baptism was "into the Jordan."

It is common to try to break the force of this by saying that John baptized so many people that it was a physical impossibility for him to immerse them all. Mr. Madsen (p. 110) has the usual objection, referring to a number "estimated as ranging from 300,000 to two millions, and within a period of six months." When our friends give us a scriptural statement as to the numbers baptized by John personally and the time within which the baptism took place, we may be willing to do a sum in proportion; but it is idle to try our arithmetic on guesses. The Scripture passage supposed to contain the difficulty is Matthew 2:5-6 : "Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Jordan, and all the region round about Jordan; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins." There is one way of testing whether sprinkling, pouring, or immersion, constituted the baptism here. If "baptize" means "sprinkle" or "pour," then the word it means may be substituted for it in the above passage. The reader is invited to make this substitution, and see if he thinks the

result is in harmony with what happened. "Were immersed of him in the river Jordan" at least makes sense. "Poured in" or "sprinkled in" does not.

Again, it might not be quite superfluous to point out that the average time taken up in a Pedobaptists sprinkling is no less than that in the average immersion. Would Mr. Madsen seek to get rid of the difficulty in John's baptism by accepting and defending John Wesley's solution:

"It seems, therefore, that they stood in ranks on the edge of the river; and that John, passing along before them, cast water on their faces, by which means he might baptize many thousands in a day"? Of course, Wesley, though picturesque, was wrong; for it is the Word of God which says John baptized "in the river Jordan" and "into the Jordan." Candidates came "up out of the water," so that they must have been down into it.

We have already cited Pedobaptists scholars--Gayford in Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Schaff, Dellinger, and Green--as holding that John immersed people; Stanley, Geikie, Edersheim, Meyer, may be added.

E. H. Plumptre says emphatically: "Immersion had clearly been practiced by John, and was involved in the original meaning of the word."

The Ethiopian Eunuch. The account of the baptism of Jesus agrees with the record in Acts 8:36-39 of the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch. There was a going "down into the water" and a coming "up out of the water." It has been held by some that the "into" of verse 38 may only denote close proximity to; but Luke before said (v. 36) they came "unto" the water, and now says that as a subsequent act they went "down into" it. If an endeavor be made to break the force of this by saying that, even if they were in the water, still sprinkling could be the act performed, we reply (a) that the very reason which now generally keeps those who practice sprinkling or pouring from going down into the water (since there is no need for such a cumbrous method) would have kept Philip from doing such a superfluous thing; while the reason which now makes a candidate for immersion go "down into" the water would sufficiently explain why the eunuch went down; (b) we learn from Romans 6:4 that baptism is a burial. So, after the eunuch went down into the water, he was there buried in baptism, and subsequently came up out of the water. We could trust any unprejudiced person who desired simply to follow Bible teaching and example to read these passages and learn from them his duty. In *The Question of Baptism* there appears the following passage: "The Rev. Isaac Rooney, F.R.G.S., who has been through the Holy Land, writes from personal observation: 'Ain Jala, on the road to Gaza, where the Ethiopian Eunuch was baptized, is not a well or pool, but a little stream flowing from a spring.' To immerse a man in it is out of the question." That is perhaps the funniest word in a book whose author has preserved it from insipidity by the insertion of many curious statements. We have not the honor of the acquaintance of "the Rev. Isaac Rooney, F.R.G.S.," which of course is not surprising when it is considered that "from personal observation" he can tell us of the eunuch's baptism and its location! As a fact, the scene of the eunuch's baptism is still keenly debated by scholars. Robinson refers to Wady-el-Hasy. Thomson, in *The Land and the Bible*, has another suggestion: " There is a fine stream of water, called Murubbah, deep enough even in June to satisfy the utmost wishes of our Baptist friends." While we do not know the site, we have the authority of the Word of God for the statement that there was water enough for two men to go down into it, and for the one there to baptize the other; baptism being a "burial." Not all Pedobaptists are unable to see that immersion

harmonizes, as sprinkling does not, with the record of the eunuch's baptism. "The context," writes R. J. Knowling in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, "indicates that the baptism was by immersion, and there can be no doubt that this was the custom in the early church."

Baptism a Burial. From Romans 6:4 and Colossians 2:12 we learn that the early Christians were buried with Christ in baptism. In sprinkling, or pouring, there is no enveloping, no covering up, such as is implied in the word "buried"; in immersion there is. Some Pedobaptists endeavor to destroy the argument from Romans 6:4 by saying that Jewish, Greek, or Roman burials were not as ours. But different modes of burial do not conflict with the fact that in burial, however performed, there is a covering up which harmonizes with what takes place in immersion, and which fails to harmonize with the act performed when a minister sprinkles water on the head or face of a child. In the Methodist tract, *Does Scripture Teach Immersion?* published by the Spectator Co., this argument occurs: "Burial, amongst the Greeks was regarded as having been officially performed when a little dust was sprinkled over the body. See the *Antigone* of Sophocles, p. 27, Donaldson's edition, 'Someone has just now Entombed the body and is gone; that is, He has sprinkled thirsty dust over the corpse, And done what else religious fear requires.' The second example is in Virgil's *Aeneid*, 6:365, Bowen's Edition. Here again the same thing, i.e., a body, lying unburied, is described, and the dead hero is made to say: 'Save me from these great sorrows my hero Over me pour Earth as in truth thou canst, And return to the Velin shore.'" This part of the tract must have been written in the hope that the reader would not look up the passages referred to. We shall give a line or two more from "Antigone," and, since Donaldson's is the translation selected by the Spectator Company, we use this. The tract referred to lines 245-247; in lines 255, 256, the same sentinel is represented as saying:

"For he Was out of sight, not closed within a tomb, But lightly overheapt with sprinkled dust, As when some passer-by will shun the curse." Of course the Greek word baptizo does not appear in the above passage; and it is clear that, if the dust were sprinkled in such abundance as to overheap the body and put it "out of sight," then there must be a very strained analogy between it and a Pedobaptists sprinkling.

Regarding the quotation from the *Aeneid*: some readers may need to be reminded that this was written in Latin, not in Greek. There is no light thrown by the passage on Paul's words, "buried with him in baptism." Why did the author of the tract use Bowen's edition? Because the word "pour" in it is suggestive of the pouring--which the tract writer calls baptism. But the Latin word for "pour" is not in the original at all. For the reader who know even the rudiments of Latin, it will be a sufficient refutation of the attempted argument to say that the words which Bowers renders "pour earth" are *terram iniice*. "Inicio" means throw or cast in, on, or over. J. W. Mackail renders Virgil's words: "Either do, then, for thou canst, cast earth over me." John Conington, once Corpus Professor of Latin in Oxford University, translates:

"And either heap, as well as you can, Some earth upon a wretched man."

It is a most unworthy thing to try to get the ignorant to believe that somehow Virgil, the great Latin poet, has settled it that a little pouring is equivalent to burial, and this with a view to keep men from going down into the water and being buried with their Saviour in baptism. If the same effort were put forth to lead people to obey as is being spent in ingenious attempts to keep them from obedience, it would be well. It must not, however, be supposed that all Pedobaptists waiters

descend to such argumentation as that to which we have just replied. Many of the ablest and most scholarly Pedobaptists advocates candidly allow, that Rom, 6:4 and Colossians 2:12 imply immersion. Already we have referred to J. V. Bartlet (Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics), Gwatkin, Dollinger, Bingham and Lambert, and John Wesley as holding this view. In addition we beg to quote the following striking admissions: "We are buried with Him (in the act of immersion) through that baptism into His death."--James Denney on Romans 6:4 in Expositor's Greek Testament.

"The rite of baptism, in which the person baptized was first buried beneath the water, and then raised from it, typified to Paul the burial and resurrection of the believer with Christ."--A. S. Peake on Colossians 2:12 in Expositor's Greek Testament.

"Baptism has three parts--descent into, burial under, and ascent out of, the water."

"Paul's statement assumes that baptism is by immersion."--A. E. Garvie, in The Century Bible.

"Immersion is implied in Romans 6:4, and Colossians 2:12."--A. Plummer, in Hastings' Bible Dictionary.

"The figure was naturally suggested by the immersion in baptism, which St. Paul interprets as symbolical of burial, the emersion similarly symbolizing the rising again to newness of life."--T. K. Abbott, on Colossians 2:12, in International Critical Commentary.

"Baptism is the grave of the old man, and the birth of the new. As he sinks beneath the baptismal waters, the believer buries there all his corrupt affections and past sins; as he emerges thence, he rises regenerate, quickened to new hopes and a new life. This it is, because it is not only the crowning act of his own faith but also the seal of God's adoption and the earnest of God's Spirit. Thus baptism is an image of his participation both in the death and in the resurrection of Christ."--LiGHTFoot on Colossians 2:12.

"This passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion."--CONYBEARE & Howson on Romans 6:4.

"The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion, and though we regard it as a point of indifferency, whether the ordinance so named be performed in this way or by sprinkling--yet we doubt not, that the prevalent style of the administration in the apostle's days was by an actual submerging of the whole body under water. We advert to this, for the purpose of throwing light on the analogy that is instituted in these verses."--CHALMERS on Romans 6:3-4.

"Baptism has a double function. (1) It brings the Christian into personal contact with Christ, so close that it may be fitly described as union with Him. (2) It expresses symbolically a series of acts corresponding to the redeeming acts of Christ.

Immersion = Death.

Submersion = Burial (the ratification of Death).

Emergence = Resurrection."

"When we descended into the baptismal water, that meant that we died with Christ--to sin. When the water closed over our heads, that meant that we lay buried with him, in proof that our death to sin, like His death, was real. But this carries with it the third step in the process. As Christ was raised from among the dead by a majestic exercise of Divine power, so we also must from henceforth conduct ourselves as men in whom has been implanted a new principle of life." Sanday & Headlam, in International Critical Commentary. In The Spectator of September 20, in "Current Topics," under the initials "A.M.", appeared the following remarks on the present subject:

"If our Lord had died by drowning instead of by crucifixion, then these passages would support the meaning for which the writer [of a note to A.M.] contends. The passages are: 'Buried with Him by baptism into death;' 'Planted together in the likeness of His death.' These refer to the 'likeness' of Christ's death. Our Saviour was lifted up on the Cross, not plunged down into a submerging method of death. How can dipping under water correspond to the 'likeness of His death?'"

Extra publicity is perhaps sufficient punishment for the above. It is in harmony with the emphatic reminder in The Question of Baptism that we are buried, "by baptism into His death, not by baptism into His grave." In reply we give two quotations from Pedobaptists authorities. The first is from the leading commentary on Romans: "But why is baptism said to be specially 'into Christ's death'? The reason is because it is owing primarily to the death of Christ that the condition into which the Christian enters at his baptism is such a changed condition."--SANDAY & Headlam. The second is from Dummelow's Commentary, quoted from by Mr. Madsen, and so admired by the Methodist Church of Victoria that it is a text book at Queen's College: "Our baptism implied such a breaking-away from the old sinful life as may be compared to death." "Our baptism signified an identification of our hearts and wills with Christ which amounted to a real union with Him, so that, while we look to His death as the ground of our acceptance, we also identify ourselves with that alienation from the sin of the world which crucified Him, of which His death was the final stage." "Therefore, our immersion beneath the waters of baptism signified death and burial with Christ from the sinful life of the world. But it is not only His death that is ours. We come up out of the water, as He rose from the dead, that we might begin to live in a new condition animated by His risen life." The number of Pedobaptists scholars of the front rank who have been cited as holding that "burial with him in baptism" refers to immersion most effectually gets rid of the suggestion of the author of The Question of Baptism, that this is a special Baptist interpretation. A word in passing may be spared in reply to Mr. Madsen's criticism that immersionists present a "conflicting symbolism of baptism," when they speak of the believer being born of water and yet as being in baptism buried with Christ. The quotations given above from Peake, Abbott, and Sanday & Headlam, remove the apparent conflict. Mr. Madsen might have reflected, though, that he could with precisely the same degree of relevancy--or irrelevancy--have found fault with the Scriptural reference to Christ's emergence from the grave in which he was buried; Christ is "the first-born from the dead" (Colossians 1:18).

John 2:23.

"John also was baptizing in a non near to Salim, because there was much water there." So says the inspired apostle. That "because" does not suit sprinkling or pouring. Mr. Madsen refers to the people's needs or the requirements of the "beasts of burden," as being the reason of the choice of location. The "beasts of burden" here are as imaginary as we saw that the infants were in the

baptism texts and the baptism in the infant texts. The apostle says John baptized at ^non, because there was much water there. As usual, we prefer the Bible statement to Mr. Madsen's gratuitous imagination. Mr. Madsen baptizes nowhere because of much water: he does not need it. Dr. Marcus Dods thus answers the contention of his less famous Pedobaptists brothers: "'Because many waters were there,' or 'much water; and therefore even in summer baptism by immersion could be continued. It is not the people's refreshment' that is in view. Why mention this any more than where they got their food?"--Expositor's Greek Testament.

Baptism of Suffering.

We read of Jesus' "baptism" of suffering in Mark 10:38 and Luke 12:50. Why is this metaphorical language employed? Clearly because the Saviour's suffering was so great, so intense, that he seemed to be enveloped, overwhelmed, by it. To liken his suffering to a sprinkling would be abhorrent to every believer. So the Oxford "Helps to the Study of the Bible" says: "The original mode of baptism was immersion. Hence the metaphorical use of the word of an overwhelming sorrow." So also Principal Salmond calls it "another figure for suffering, overwhelming suffering in which one is immersed or submerged."

Baptism in the Holy Spirit. In several places in the New Testament we have mention of baptism in the Holy Spirit (e.g., Matthew 2:11; Acts 1:5; Acts 11:16). This language is figurative. Whether baptism is sprinkling, pouring or immersion, no one believes either that people were literally sprinkled, poured or immersed in the Spirit, or that the Holy Spirit was literally poured or sprinkled upon them. The baptism in the Holy Spirit is only explicable on the view that the Spirit so took possession of those who were recipients of it that they might fitly be said to be enveloped in or overwhelmed by it. Neander says: "In respect to the form of baptism, it was in conformity with the original institution and the original import of the symbol, performed by immersion, as a sign of entire baptism into the Holy Spirit, of being entirely penetrated by the same."--Church History, I., p. 422. When the Scriptures describe the action of God in sending the Spirit in such abundant measure upon men that the result could be called a baptism, they use such expressions as these: "On the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 10:45). "He hath shed [R.V., poured] forth this" (Acts s: 33). In the Methodist tract, Does Scripture Teach Immersion? we have a reference to such texts under the heading, "How God Baptized"; the writer stating: "No jugglery with words can get away from God's plain definition given in this passage. Baptism means pouring, and by that method the true baptism, that of the Spirit, was given on Pentecost."

Let us examine this. (i) If because the Holy Spirit is stated to have been poured out, we may therefore say pouring is baptism, what about the text, "The Holy Spirit fell on them" (Acts 11:15)? Will some brilliant exegete found a new sect with "falling" as the Scriptural mode of baptism? (2) We call attention to the fact that our Pedobaptists friends confuse two things, viz., the act of God in sending the Spirit, and the resultant effect on the disciples. That effect was such that the disciples, as it were, were overwhelmed by, immersed in, the Spirit. Plumptre, the well-known Church of England commentator, thus refers to this baptism of the apostles: "Their spirits were to be so fully baptized, i.e., plunged, into the power of the Divine Spirit, as their bodies had been plunged in the waters of the Jordan" (on Acts 1:5). (3) We wish to emphasize this, that if "baptism means pouring," then the thing poured is the thing baptized, and vice versa. If the Holy Spirit was poured, and if pouring is baptism, then it was the Holy Spirit that was baptized! "No jugglery with words"

can disprove that. Similarly if the disciples were baptized, and if baptism is pouring, then the disciples were poured! But the Holy Spirit was not baptized, nor were the disciples poured: the Bible teaching is that God poured out the Spirit in such profusion that as a result the disciples were baptized. (4) When the Bible says the Holy Spirit was poured or shed (Acts 2:17-18; Acts 2:33; Acts 10:45), it has to be borne in mind that the word thus translated is *ekcheo*, not *baptizo*. Nobody disputes that the former word means pour out, but we ask in vain for a shred of evidence that *baptizo* has this meaning.

1 Corinthians 10:1-2.

Amongst the passages which Mr. Madsen thinks definitely exclude immersion is the above. Paul says:--"Our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." It is plain that the chief point of the comparison made by Paul between the Israelites and the Christians to whom he was writing was that as the "fathers" were baptized into a new relationship to Moses, so were the Christians baptized into a new relation to Christ. As Prof. Findlay in *The Expositor's Greek Testament* puts it: "'They all received their baptism unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea,' since in this act they committed themselves to the guidance of Moses, entering through him into acknowledged fellowship with God." Does Paul's allusion show that baptism is not necessarily immersion?

Mr. Madsen says: "The baptism of the cloud was probably by rain drops, and of the sea by flying spray. But it was the glory of the passage through the sea that not a man of Israel's pilgrim people was immersed. When Pharaoh's host attempted the passage, they received immersion, with disastrous consequences."

Briefly we may reply: (1) The baptism of 1 Corinthians 10:1-2 must surely be interpreted in harmony with what the same writer said in Romans 6:4 of baptism as a burial. (2) Mr. Madsen seems to imply that there was a baptism "of the cloud" and a baptism "of the sea." Now Paul gives no hint that there was a baptism in the cloud, or in the sea, separately; but "in the cloud and in the sea." "The cloud was over the upraised and congealed walls, and the people passed through this sea-cloud channel." (3) Mr. Madsen's rain-drops are imaginary ones; a reference to Exodus 12:21-22 will show that the cloud is not represented as a watery cloud, but that which led the people as a pillar of fire by night and as a cloud by day. (4) The alleged baptism by flying spray of the sea is out of harmony with two Biblical facts: (i) the waters were congealed (Exodus 15:8); (ii.) the Israelites passed over by dry ground (Exodus 14:29). This forbids the sprinkling of rain as the baptism. Again, if spray had been blown across a channel wide enough to allow a company containing six hundred thousand men, besides children and cattle (Exodus 12:37), to cross in a single night, let the reader judge how "dry" the ground on the one side must have been! (5) Yes, the "Egyptians were immersed, and more than immersed; they were drowned; but the Israelites were simply baptized." Not all Pedobaptists are inclined to cavil at 1 Corinthians 10:1-2. Schaff would infer immersion from this very passage. So would Prof. Knowling. Plummer gives it as his opinion that: "Being under the cloud points to submersion, while passing through the sea may signify emersion."--Article on "Baptism," in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*.

Meyer, on 1 Corinthians 10:2, says of the preposition *en*, "in," that it is local, "indicating the element in which, by immersion and emergence, the baptism was effected."

Alford comments: "'Received baptism to Moses;' entered by the act of such immersion into a solemn covenant with God." "The allegory is obviously not to be pressed minutely: for neither did they enter the cloud nor were they wetted by the waters of the sea; but they passed under both, as the baptized passes under the water."-- Commentary on 1 Corinthians 10:2.

1 Peter 2:20-21.

Peter says: "While the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved through water: which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism." Whereupon Mr. Madsen remarks: "These eight souls--saved through water--were not immersed; that was reserved for the people who remained outside the ark."

How does this help a man who says sprinkling or pouring is baptism? We thought the pouring also was reserved for the disobedient outsiders! It was not a little sprinkling that either saved Noah's company or drowned the others! Peter says that Noah was saved by water; he also says that in a sense water (in the antitype, baptism) saves the Christians. There is nothing here inconsistent with the thought of immersion. Prof. Knowling, E. H. Plumptre and other Pedobaptists believe that the type of the Flood presupposes immersion as baptism.

Baptism of Three Thousand. From Acts 2:41 is inferred the baptism of three thousand persons in one day. Mr. Madsen says that "to assert that these were all immersed is to defy probability." He quotes Mr. Rooney as saying that such immersion "was a physical and geographical impossibility. Jerusalem is on a hill, and there is no pool of water in which people could be immersed."

There were acres of water within easy distance, including the following pools: Bethesda, Solomon's Pool, Siloam, Old Pool, Pool of Hezekiah, Upper and Lower Gihon. Josephus mentions places of bathing in the Tower of Antonia.

Mr. Madsen brings in the usual objection that the Jews would not allow their waters to be polluted. From John 5:1-4; John 9:7-11, we learn that such objection does not lie against Siloam and Bethesda. But it has been further objected that these pools were in the charge of the apostles' enemies; and so the use would be withheld. Mr. Madsen hints at this when he remarks on the improbability of water being available "for the sake of Christian baptism in the city which crucified Jesus Christ." It is wonderful how often the Scriptures contain answers to modern objectors: Luke annihilates the above objection when he says that the disciples had "favor with all the people" (Acts 2:47). but Mr. Rooney says it was a physical impossibility! How many qualified baptizers were there? We know not; there were twelve apostles, but numbers besides, for the company of disciples amounted to one hundred and twenty (Acts 1:15), and it was long before the days when clerical hands alone were supposed to validate the sacraments. But suppose only the twelve apostles officiated. If Peter spoke for three hours (he began about 9 a.m.; see Acts 2:15), then baptizing could begin at noon. A man can easily immerse another in a minute; twelve could baptize twelve in a minute, seven hundred and twenty in an hour, and three thousand in four hours and ten minutes. So the apostles could have done it all themselves in an afternoon, with time enough to take a rest for one hour and three quarters in the middle of their work. Still, someone may say: You cannot do baptizing according to the rule of three; theoretically it could be done, but, practically, not so. Well, in the Telugu country in India, on July 3rd, 1878, there were 24 baptized in one day. At six o'clock in the morning two native preachers took their place in the river. When

these two became tired, two others took their places, and they in turn were relieved by still other two. At eleven the work stopped for the usual midday meal and rest. It was resumed at two, and about five o'clock the converts had been "buried with Christ in baptism" by six men, only two of them officiating at the same time. Not all Pedobaptists write foolishly about "a physical and geographical impossibility." E. H. Plumptre, in Ellicott's New Testament Commentary, says of the baptism of the three thousand: "(1) Immersion had clearly been practiced by John, and was involved in the original meaning of the word, and it is not likely that the rite would have been curtailed of its full proportions at the very outset. (2) The symbolic meaning of the act required immersion in order that it might be clearly manifested, and Romans 6:4 and 1 Peter 2:21, seem almost of necessity to imply the more complete mode. The pools or swimming-baths of Bethesda and Siloam (see John 5:7; John 9:7), or the so-called Pool of the Virgin, near the Temple enclosure, or the bathing-places within the Tower of Antony (Jos. Wars, V. 5, section 8), may well have helped to make the process easy." What of Rev. Rooney's "no pool" and "geographical impossibility after this?"

Baptism of the Samaritans. Of the baptisms recorded in Acts 8:12, Mr. Madsen writes: "A similar difficulty as to the water supply has to be met in conceiving the Samaritan revival, with the subsequent baptism of multitudes, as being by immersion. If this transpired in the capital city, it would appear that Jacob's Well was its reservoir. Upon that supposition, it is to be remembered that, in Christ's time a woman of the city came out to the well to draw water. It is scarcely thinkable that the well could be used for immersing the converts, since the woman of Samaria knew of no other place where water could be had" (p. 111). No passage in *The Question of Baptism* shows more confusion or inaccuracy than this. Nobody ever suggested, in spite of Mr. Madsen's implication, that "the Samaritan revival" was "by immersion"! Mr. Madsen calmly takes it for granted that "the capital city" was the city from which the woman of Samaria referred to in John 4:1-54 came to draw water at Jacob's Well. John 4:3 definitely tells us that Sychar was the city to which Jesus came. Now Sychar was not "the capital city." The capital city was of old called Samaria, and since the time of Herod the Great Sebaste; it was miles away from Jacob's Well.

Nobody with knowledge of Palestinian geography fancies that the people of "the capital city" were dependent upon Jacob's Well for drinking or baptizing. The city of Sebaste had plenty of water of its own. Josephus says Hyrcanus "brought streams to drown it"; while this could only refer to the lower part of the city, it is clear that there was water enough nearby. Sir Charles Wilson refers to "two fine springs" in the vicinity of the modern village, "from which small streams flow for a short distance." I may add that while it used to be debated whether Luke in Acts 8:5 referred to "a city of Samaria," or to the capital city, the revisers, because of the weight of manuscript authority, have adopted the reading "the city of Samaria." This means "the capital city." Further, when Mr. Madsen says "the woman of Samaria knew of no other place where water could be had," he pens what he must know he could not prove if his life depended upon it.

We must express our sorrow at having to answer such an argument as that which we have quoted above from *The Question of Baptism*. Whether it was due to the lamentable ignorance of the author thereof, or to his unbounded confidence in the ignorance of those he would be likely to succeed in keeping from baptism, we do not know.

Ezekiel 36:25. The Methodist tract previously referred to cites Ezekiel 36:25 as deciding by "word of prophecy" that sprinkling is baptism. It says: "How perfectly the change of heart in His people is described. Dr. Guthrie called it 'the Gospel in Ezekiel.' And God symbolizes it by the sprinkling of water. 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean. From all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you.' Is anything more beautiful than that?"

No; nothing is more beautiful than that; and nothing is more gratuitous or incapable of proof than that the prophecy refers to baptism. There is no such identification in Scripture. The tract writer refers to Dr. Guthrie. Guthrie in his book, *The Gospel in Ezekiel*, correctly describes the "clean water" referred to by Ezekiel. He calls our attention to Numbers 19:1-22, where the "water of separation" or purification is described. Guthrie writes: "The water is such as the Jews understood by clean water--not free from impurity, and in itself clean, but that maketh clean--in the words of the ceremonial law, 'water of purifying.' This was prepared according to a divinely appointed ritual. Look how it was prepared, and you shall see it reddening and changing into blood" (p. 244).'

After alluding to Numbers 19:1-22 and the ashes of the red heifer therein referred to, Guthrie says: "These [the ashes], being carefully collected, are mixed with pure water in a pure vessel--and that water is the clean water of my text" (p. 245).

Guthrie rightly finds such water typical of something higher even than baptism. A century ago the challenge was made by Alexander Campbell that anyone would show where sprinkling or pouring mere water on any person for any moral, ceremonial or religious use, was ever done by the authority of God since the world began. The challenge is not met by referring to Ezekiel 36:25; for illustrious Pedobaptists confess that that "clean water" was not water by itself. The sprinkling of Ezekiel 36:25, moreover, was done by God; baptism in water has been committed to Christ's disciples as their work, and for the performance of that there is a going down into the water, a burial therein, and a coming up out of the water.

01.011. The Evil of Infant Sprinkling

The Evil of Infant Sprinkling.

"Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."-- Matthew 5:19.

"It is highly necessary that we remind ourselves, how great presumption it is to make light of any institutions of divine appointment; that our obligations to obey all God's commands whatever are absolute and indispensable; and that commands merely positive, admitted to be from him, lay us under a moral obligation to obey them, an obligation moral in the strictest and most proper sense."--BISHOP Butler, in *The Analogy of Religion*.

There are to be found many people who confess that in apostolic days believers were immersed, but who acquiesce in the change to the sprinkling of water upon infants. After all, what does it matter? There are some who look upon the discussion regarding baptism as a dispute concerning such a little thing that it makes no difference whichever way it is decided. Convenience, taste, custom, seem to settle it one way or another: why should not each way be equally good? We wish therefore to make a brief statement of some reasons why we cannot agree that infant baptism or sprinkling is as good as the immersion of a penitent believer.

There is the question of divine warrant to be considered. Ministers of all Pedobaptists churches repeat over infants, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Not one of them can show any authority from Father, Son or Holy Spirit. Love of truth and reverence for God's name should keep us from using the Divine name without warrant. Shall we do what God asks in the way he asks? Infant baptism v. believers' baptism, sprinkling v. immersion, is another way of saying disobedience v. obedience. Is obedience to God not an important enough thing for us to insist upon? Were we to allow that baptism is a little thing, still would not love to Christ make us regard that little thing he asks? Read the text at the head of this article, and see the Saviour's opinion about obedience to little commands.

Infant sprinkling tends to destroy the unity of the Spirit. See Ephesians 4:5; there is "one baptism." We have quoted the admissions of many Pedobaptists that infant baptism and sprinkling were not found in apostolic days. If the "one baptism" is for Paul necessary to "the unity of the Spirit," and if Christian Union is necessary for the conversion of the world, than it is a serious thing to put something else in place of the baptism for which we have explicit Scriptural authority.

There is often serious harm done to the subject of infant baptism. We frequently hear it said: "Well, at least it can do the child no harm." Is this so? What happens in the case of many "baptized" in infancy who grow up in a manifestly unconverted state? "Thousands grow up with the belief that in infancy they were made Christians--they speak of 'Our Saviour' and go now and then to church. That they are not Christians never enters their heads. Tell them so, and they indignantly ask whether you think them Jews or Pagans. Were they not born in a Christian land? and were they

not made children of God in holy baptism? But for this delusion they might be brought to discern their true condition; and such discernment would lead in many instances to deep concern and true conversion."

It is sad to think how sprinkling of water on unconscious infants for baptism has obscured the symbolism of the ordinance. He who reads Romans 6:3-4 should learn that immersion is not a purely arbitrary requirement. Our Lord Jesus died, was buried, and rose again: Paul lets us know that these are the great facts of the gospel (1 Corinthians 15:1-4), the ground of our hope. Every time a penitent believer is baptized, the great facts are in act confessed. The believer has died to sin, is buried with Christ, and rises from the watery grave to walk in a new life. Conybeare and Howson, the well-known Church of England writers, say: "Baptism was (unless in exceptional cases) administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must be a subject of regret that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism (though perhaps necessary in our northern climates) has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very important passages of Scripture."

We altogether disagree with the parenthetical words in the above; but the writers' remarks are otherwise noteworthy.

It would be well for all to do just what God would have them do, and to trust the Divine Wisdom, which will lay upon us no unreasonable command. God wishes us to become "obedient from the heart to that form of teaching" delivered by him (Romans 6:17).

"Thy will is good and just, Shall I Thy will withstand?"

If Jesus bids me lick the dust, I bow at His command."

It may be added that we believe that the commission as recorded in Mark 16:15-16 may rightly be used in conjunction with Matthew 28:19-20 as showing the need of preaching, belief, baptism, and subsequent teaching, in the order named. The Methodist tract, *Should Only Believers be Baptized?* states our view exactly when it says of Mark 16:16, "This does not apply to infants at all." The terms of the commission applied to those to whom the message was preached. We refrain here from pressing the use of Mark 16, because our Pedobaptists friends, however frequent their references to and use of Mark 16:9-20 on noncontroversial occasions, always object to its quotation regarding baptism, on the ground that the passage "is not in the oldest copies of Mark's Gospel." We have a sufficient number of Scriptures for our position without stopping to argue the genuineness of this passage. The above holds good whether John 3:5 alludes to baptism or not. If "born of water" refers to baptism, as we believe, and as A. Plummer in his article on Baptism in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary* declares was universally believed till the days of Calvin, then we see that baptism is initiatory into the kingdom which, in so far as it is manifest on earth in an organized form, is the church. Mr. Madsen believes "all children, by virtue of the Universal Atonement of Christ, are members of the Kingdom of God, and are entitled to be received into the visible Church of Christ by baptism."

02.00.1. First Principles

FIRST PRINCIPLES

STUDIES IN BIBLE TRUTH

A. R. MAIN: M.A.

Austral Ptg. & Publ. Co.,

524-530 Elizabeth St., Melbourne.

02.00.2. PREFACE.

PREFACE.

THE articles in this hand-book treat of subjects selected as a special course of study by various Bible School Unions of Churches of Christ in Australasia. It was considered advisable that greater attention should be given to themes of fundamental importance, subjects dealing with distinctive principles, than could possibly be given in following the series of lessons chosen by the International Lesson Committee. Primarily, this hand-book has been written for teachers and senior scholars using the lessons and preparing for examination on them. But the articles are intended also to help all others who may be so much interested in the great themes as to read them. While the writer alone is responsible for the treatment, it is believed that the views of the great majority of members of Churches of Christ are presented. Above all, it is hoped that there is no misrepresentation of Bible teaching; if there is, it is so unwittingly. Exigencies of space prevent detailed treatment, but it is trusted that the studies will not be found scrappy. It is appropriate that in Bible lessons many references be made to the Scriptures. It is recommended that the passages quoted or referred to be carefully read, preferably in the Revised Version. It is not intended that all these references be forced on scholars, or that junior classes should be expected to get up all the matter dealt with in these articles. Bible Classes could profitably use this booklet as a text-book, each member of the class possessing a copy. The questions appended to the lessons are suitable some for intermediate and some for senior classes. No answer of "Yes" or "No" merely should be accepted by the teacher of these classes. Reasons should always be given, and older scholars should be encouraged to support their answers with citations from Scripture. The teacher is reminded of Colet's famous advice: "Teach lovingly what thou hast learned diligently."

02.01. THE BIBLE - 01 - God's Book

THE BIBLE – 01 - God's Book Reading. Psalms 119:97-112; Hebrews 8:6-13.

Golden Text. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.--Isaiah 40:8.

Daily Readings. Psalms 19:7-11; Deuteronomy 6:1-9; 1 Peter 1:23-25; Acts 20:32; 2 Timothy 3:14-17; Hebrews 4:2-12; Revelation 22:18-19; 2 Peter 1:16-21; Jeremiah 31:31-34.

OUR word Bible comes from a Greek word biblia, so called from the byblos or papyrus reed which formed the material for ancient books. The name biblia means books, and denotes the fact that our Bible contains not one book, but many. We have a library and not a single volume. The Greek Christians centuries ago called their sacred Scriptures "The Books." In the thirteenth century, when it was thought wrongly that biblia was a singular noun, Christians began to speak of "The Book." They expressed, as we do when we speak of "The Bible," belief both in the unity which exists amidst the diversity of the sacred library and in the unique position occupied by it. For us, as for Sir Walter Scott in his dying hour, "There is but one book." Whether we view it as literature, or from the higher aspect as a guide of life, a guide to life eternal, a guide to God, it is unparalleled, unapproached and unapproachable. The divine library is made up of sixty six books; written by many different authors of different race, social position and temperament, published at intervals during a period of fifteen hundred years. These books comprise varied kinds of literature--law, prophecy, history, epistles, poetry. This book or library which we call "The Bible " it is evident, makes its appeal to us not simply as rivaling or excelling all other books in merit. Its writers do not seek to vie with other literature. The Bible Claims to Be God's Book.

The fact that this claim is made by the book itself is important, for we can only judge it aright in the light of its own demand. The Old Testament may first be cited. We have over and over again in the opening books the phrase, "The Lord said unto Moses," or a kindred expression (Exodus 6:1; Exodus 6:10, etc., etc.). We read "The Lord spoke unto Joshua" (Joshua 1:1). As we look toward the end of the Old Testament, we have the prophets proclaiming, "Hear ye the word of the Lord" (Isaiah 1:10); "Thus saith the Lord, the Lord of Hosts" (Isaiah 1:24); "The word of the Lord came to me, saying" (Jeremiah 1:4); "Thus saith the Lord God" (Ezekiel 5:5); "The burden of the word of the Lord to Israel by Malachi" (Malachi 1:1). A glance at the prophetic books particularly is instructive. Our chosen reading deals specially with the view taken by the Psalmist. Psalms 119:1-176 is one of the mnemonic or alphabetical psalms, specially prepared for committal to memory. Each verse in it praises God's word. See the titles given to it in our lesson. We have God's law, commandments, testimonies, precepts, judgments, words, word, Statutes. See the word "thy" throughout. All are God's. A similar claim to possession of a divine word and law is found in Psalms 19:7-11, where also the effect of acceptance of the word of God is mentioned. When we turn to the New Testament, we find appeals made to the Old Testament Scriptures as books of God. We have Paul writing to Timothy of "the Holy Scriptures" or "the sacred writings," which were precisely the books we include in our Old Testament (2 Timothy 3:15-16). The same

apostle speaks of "the word of God" (Ephesians 6:17). The apostle Peter, referring particularly to the Old Testament prophets, says, "Men spoke from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Peter 1:21). We have our Lord Jesus Christ himself making use of the claim. He referred to the Old Testament books as "the Scriptures" (John 5:39) and each of his hearers knew exactly the books so described. He referred to the message of old as "the word of God" (John 10:35). He looked upon the Old Testament books as written to lead to himself. "Beginning from Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke 24:27; cf. Luke 24:44-45). Side by side with this claim, we naturally find a specific claim to authority. (a) We may note again the highest of teachers, the Lord Jesus. With him it was a sufficient answer to Satan that "It is written" (Matthew 4:4) · Men erred, he said, because they knew not the Scriptures (Matthew 22:29), He did certain things that the Scriptures might be fulfilled (Matthew 21:4, etc.). He declared that not one jot or little should pass away from the law till all were fulfilled (Matthew 5:18). He said, "The Scripture cannot be broken (John 10:35). (b) The witness of the apostles, to whom Jesus promised the Holy Spirit that he might guide them into all truth, may be cited. For Paul's testimony, see 2 Timothy 3:16-17, already referred to: the Scriptures contain enough to furnish completely the man of God. John regards the teaching of Christ as so authoritative and sufficient that he says: 'whosoever goeth onward [or "taketh the lead," R.V., margin] and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God" (1 John 2:9). The Bible practically closes with the pronouncement of a terrible doom against anyone who will dare to add to or take from the words of the book (see Revelation 22:18-19 which Christians accept as applicable to all the sacred writings). It is for these and similar reasons that we who are members of the church for which Christ gave himself, we who are Christians only, who believe the Bible to be indeed God's book, have accepted that book as our sole and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. We use and try to live up to the motto, "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent." If the passages referred to in the previous paragraph present the truth of God we can hardly be wrong in unswerving loyalty to the Bible, or in declining to accept any substitute for the Bible, or even any subordinate standard of appeal. We but say with the Lord Jesus that human tradition when exalted into a rule of faith or conduct makes "void the word of God" (Matthew 15:6), we have learnt of him that to teach for doctrines the commandments of men makes vain our attempted worship (Mark 7:7).

02.02. THE BIBLE - 02 - Why Do We Accept the Bible's Claim?

THE BIBLE – 02 - Why Do We Accept the Bible's Claim?

It would need a volume to give a moderate outline of the many sound reasons which Christians give for their belief in the Bible as the Word of God. We have only room for a few headings. 1. The marvelous unity and harmony of the Bible, written by between thirty and forty men at intervals during a period of over fifteen centuries, witness to its divine origin. There is unity of purpose, to teach men God's will and to help them to do it. There is unity in its treatment of sin and its cure. From the beginning to end we have the Savior. The seed of the woman of Genesis 3:1-24 appears in Revelation as the Lamb who redeemed. 2. The effect of the Bible on the lives of men proves its claim. Where the Bible is believed and taken as guide, there always men are elevated. As we see its results, we "cannot believe that such traits are wrought into human character by the belief of a book whose writers are impostors, and whose distinctive claim for itself is a falsehood"; 'the belief of a falsehood is injurious to men, while the belief of truth alone is truly and permanently beneficial." If so, the Bible justifies itself. 3. The superior morality of the Bible is only explicable on our acceptance of its claims. We have not got beyond the morality of the Bible. The best laws of civilised lands are framed according to its precepts. The Sermon on the Mount is unapproached and unapproachable in outside literature. Worldlings have as their chief objection, not that the Bible is not the best of books, but that Christians do not live up to the teaching of the Bible. 4. The Bible revelation of God is such that when we compare it with the theology of other books and systems, we are convinced of its transcendent excellence. There is no reason to believe that the actual men who wrote the Bible were geniuses, ahead of the best of the Greeks and Romans. Their purer theology is due to the fact that the Spirit of God directed them. 5. The character of Christ revealed in the New Testament could not possibly be the invention of men. The purity of that life is such, the delineation of the model character is so perfect, that we are compelled to believe that the writers drew from a holy original. Thus we pass to a belief in Jesus, and thence to a belief in his divine claims and the Scriptures he endorsed. 6. The Bible is adapted to man's needs. It meets his wants; it satisfies his longings. Coleridge said he knew the Bible was inspired because it found him at greater depths of his being than did any other book. The Bible is its own witness. As we read it, we feel the truthfulness of its narrative, the honesty of its writers. The Bible, we have to acknowledge, knows the heart of man. 7. We can test the Bible by its fulfilled prophecies. Some of these we have in process of fulfilment. Read what the Bible says of the Jews and their separation, then lift up your eyes and look. The Jew is a living miracle. Read Isaiah 53:1-12 (certainly written centuries before Jesus came); we cannot believe that the prophecy and its fulfilment were in any way arranged by man. The prophecy and the claims of Jesus are both attested. 8. In various ways the Bible has been tested. It has withstood the assaults of the centuries. It has endured the keenest scrutiny, the test of history, geography, philosophy, science. Archaeology to-day proves the accuracy of its statements. Had the Bible been a human book, it must have been discarded. Instead, no book approaches it in living interest. It is circulated in more lands to-day than ever before; it is believed in by more people than ever before; more copies of it

are being printed than ever. Why? There is one answer which is adequate: it is the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever (1 Peter 1:25).

02.03. THE BIBLE - 03 - The Divisions of the Bible

THE BIBLE – 03 - The Divisions of the Bible

Our Bible is divided into two great parts, the Old Testament and the New Testament, the former consisting of thirty-nine books, and relating especially to the Old Covenant or Jewish dispensation, and the latter of twenty-seven, relating more particularly to the New Covenant in Christ, or Christian dispensation. These both came from God. The relation of the two is well described in the oft-quoted passage: "The Old Testament Scriptures are essentially one with the New; both are so compacted that the latter may be said to rest upon the former, since the former are pregnant with types and shadows which find their realisation in the latter. The Old Testament is the New Testament concealed, and the New Testament is the Old Testament revealed." The Jews divided their Scriptures into three classes--the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings (cf. Luke 24:44). The law consisted of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. The prophets were subdivided into (a) Former: Joshua, Judges 1:1-36 and 2 Samuel 1:1-27 and 2 Kings; (b) Latter: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zachariah, Malachi. The Writings (sometimes called the Psalms, from the first and most important division) included Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Solomon Ruth, Lamentations of Jeremiah, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah 1:1-11 and 2 Chronicles. The New Testament Scriptures may be sub-divided into: 1. Testimonies to Christ or The Gospels: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. These tell the story of Jesus, and were written to induce faith in him (see John 20:31). 2. History of conversions: Acts of Apostles. This is a book of conversions. It tells of the preaching of the gospel, the establishment of the church, the growth of the cause of Christ. He who wants to answer the question, "What shall I do to be saved?" must go to this book. We have there seekers of salvation instructed by inspired men as to the way of life. If we follow these models, we cannot go wrong. 3. Instructions to Christians in twenty-one letters, from Romans to Jude. These tell us how the man who has believed in the Christ of whom the Gospels bear witness, and has accepted him as Savior and Lord in the manner revealed in the book of Acts of Apostles, should live a godly life in Christ. They are full of teaching, profitable for the individual Christian and for the church. 4. Prophecy. Revelation, or the Apocalypse (a Greek word meaning "uncovering"), consists largely of "prophecy couched in the language of symbolism." It "gives in prophetic symbols a vision of the fortunes and destinies of the church and her enemies." It has much to say of the second coming of Christ, and of the great struggles and events which are to precede it. The foregoing paragraphs suggest the importance of using the Bible aright. In reading a book we should always seek to know to which division it belongs, the persons addressed, the occasion upon which and the purpose for which it was written for instance, if a man wishes to know the testimony concerning Jesus, he should not be referred to Chronicles or to Habakkuk, but to the Gospels designed by God to bring to belief in Christ. If a man wants to know the way of salvation, we should refer him to Acts, not to Psalms, or Isaiah, which were written long before the Lord Jesus sent out men to preach the gospel. The young Christian should feed on the Epistles of the New Testament. We do not mean that any book should be ignored; but it is true that the

purposes of the various books should be regarded. Particularly, the distinction between the two great covenants should be noted. A vast amount of mischief has been done on the one hand by those who seek in the Old Testament for details concerning the New, and on the other of those who would bring over into the New Covenant rites and priestly notions which were only given by God in the Old. The letter to the Hebrews is the best book to read on these covenants. Hebrews 8:7-13 refers to the Old and the New. The abrogation of the Old Covenant is also declared in Ephesians 2:14-17; Colossians 2:14. Jeremiah had foretold the New Covenant (Jeremiah 31:31-34) and had said that it would not be according to the first covenant. John 1:17 states the great distinction between the two: "The law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." That verse does not mean that there was no truth in the Old, or no favor of God; but its prevailing character was one of law, only the man who perfectly obeyed could stand uncondemned, while he who did not continue in all things written was cursed (Galatians 3:10). As opposed to that Jesus revealed the grace of God, the fullest truth; there were mercy and pardon provided for the sinner; God in Christ did what the law could not do (Romans 8:3). Of course there is not license because there is freedom from "the law"; Christians are under the law of Christ (1 Corinthians 9:21), the law of love (Romans 13:10; James 2:8). We repeatedly read in the New Testament of "the law" and "the faith" (see e.g., Galatians 3:23). In addition to the passages cited above, the following Scriptures clearly reveal the contrast between the two covenants: Galatians 4:21-31; 2 Corinthians 3:6-14; Hebrews 12:18-25. M. P. Hayden thus sums up the characteristics of the two covenants as given in the passages referred to:-- "The First or Old Covenant.

Established at Mt. Sinai in Arabia

Established with Abraham's seed according to the flesh.

Established by Moses as mediator.

Written and engraver on stones.

Secured the land of Canaan and earthly blessings.

Enjoined temporal rewards and punishments.

Was made with the Jewish nation only.

Exhibited the gospel in shadow, or type.

Is styled by Paul 'the letter,' 'the ministration of death,' and 'ministration of condemnation.'

Was 'done away,' 'nailed to the cross,' at the crucifixion of Christ (Colossians 2:14).

The Second or New Covenant.

Established at Mt Zion, or Jerusalem.

Established with Abraham's seed through faith. [I. e., All--who are of the faith, for 'they which be of faith, the same are sons of Abraham.' See Galatians 3:7-9.]

Established by Christ as Mediator.

Written in the heart.

Secures the heavenly Canaan and Spiritual blessings.

Enjoins eternal rewards and punishments.

Is made with persons of 'all the nations.'

Exhibits the gospel in reality, or anti-type.

Is styled by Paul, 'the Spirit,' 'the ministration of righteousness.'

Remains and continues for ever (Isaiah 55:3).

Hence, of these two covenants, one was carnal, based on flesh; the other was spiritual, based on faith. Israelites were included in the Old Covenant, Christians in the New Covenant Moses was the mediator of the one, Christ of the other, one was typical, the other anti-typical; one national, the other personal and ecumenical. The first covenant was established to educate and prepare the world for the second; and when the first had served its purpose and Christ had come and fulfilled the types of the Old Covenant, it was 'finished,' 'nailed to the cross, or done away.' "

Let us not close this study without a recognition of the fact that the Scriptures are given for our guidance in life. We need not knowledge alone, hut doing. We must receive with meekness the implanted word which is able to save our soul (James 1:21; James 1:23). We must lay the word up in our hearts, so that we may not sin against God (Psalms 119:11). As we study or teach this lesson our appropriate prayer will be, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law" (Psalms 119:18). Or we may express our heart's longing in the words of the noble collect: "Blessed Lord, who hast caused all holy Scriptures to be written for our learning: Grant that we may in such wise hear them, read, mark, learn and inwardly digest them, that by patience, and comfort of thy holy Word, we may embrace, land ever hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life which thou has given us in our Savior Jesus Christ. Amen."

QUESTIONS.

1. What is meant by "The Bible"?
2. How does our Old Testament reading witness to the Bible's claim to be God's book?
3. Quote the Savior's testimony to the Old Testament as the Word of God.
4. (a) What is meant by the authority of the Bible? (b) To what passages would you refer in proof of the Bible's claim to authority?
5. Give three of the strongest reasons for accepting the Bible's claim to be God's book.
6. (a) What are the two greatest divisions of the Bible? (b) Why are they so called?
7. In what relation do these two great divisions stand to each other?
8. (a) Give a three-fold classification of the Old Testament Scriptures, and (b) assign the books to their proper classes.
9. (a) Classify the New Testament books and (b) state the function of each division.
10. Show the importance of a right division of the Word of God.
11. Give some practical rules for Bible study.
12. What are the chief differences between the two great covenants?

02.04. SIN AND ITS CURE

SIN AND ITS CURE Reading. Genesis 3:1-19.

Golden Text. For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.--Romans 6:23.

Daily Readings. Romans 6:12-23; Mark 7:14-23; Romans 1:18-32; Romans 3:10-26; Romans 5:12-21; 2 Corinthians 5:14-21; Isaiah 53:1-12.

OUR Scripture reading gives God's account of the origin of evil in the world, and also foreshadows the remedy for sin. That wickedness abounds is clear, whether we accept the Bible or not. Its terrible consequences in this life are manifest, irrespective of what its effect may be on our eternal destiny. But only from the Holy Scriptures can we arrive at the real nature of sin, and only there can we learn of the means of relief from its deadly bane.

Origin and Nature.

The Bible teaches that man was originally in a state of innocence, walked with God, and enjoyed communion with him. God gave him beautiful surroundings, healthy occupation, dominion over the lower creation, abundant provision for his needs. But one restriction was put on his liberty of action. Of the tree in the midst of the garden, the tree of knowledge of good and evil, Adam was forbidden to eat, under penalty of death. Seduced by the serpent--or Satan in the form of a serpent (cf. John 8:44-46; Revelation 12:9)--Eve ate of the forbidden fruit, and induced Adam also to partake of it. As soon as Eve's belief of Satan's lie and disbelief of God's truth led her to disobey the commandment of God, sin was in the world. The "Shorter Catechism" has a good definition: "Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God." The Apostle John tells us that "sin is lawlessness" (1 John 3:4), deviation from or contrariety to law. "Sin is disobedience to the law of God in will or deed." The Lord Jesus has taught us to look beyond the outward act to the inward feeling and motive. Other Scriptural descriptions of sin are: "All unrighteousness is sin" (1 John 5:17). "To him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not to him it is sin" (James 4:17). "The thought of foolishness is sin" (Proverbs 24:9). "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Romans 14:23). Jesus summed up the requirements of God's law in two great commands: Love God; love your neighbor (Matthew 22:37-40). We may therefore say that "any departure in thought word, or deed, from the rule of conduct which requires us to love the Lord our God with all the heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, and our neighbor as ourselves, is sin." It has to be remembered that sin is an offence against God. Even our offences against one another are sins against God. David, when he had previously harmed another, yet said, "against thee, thee only, have I sinned" (Psalms 51:4). Remembrance of this is important, for it at once follows that there can be no pardon, no remedy, hut from God. The consequences of sin may be seen in our reading from Genesis. We note: (1) Guilt. Having disobeyed God, man at once passed from his state of innocence to that of guilt. Adam was conscious of this, for he tried to hide from God. (2) Banishment. God drove him out of the garden (Genesis 3:23-24). All sin tends to alienate from God. Sin results in loss of

communion and favor. "Your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you" (Isaiah 59:2). (3) Death. God had distinctly told our first parents that they would die if they disobeyed him (Genesis 2:17). The writer believes that the Scriptures teach that a penalty for sin was death, both spiritual and physical (Genesis 2:17; Genesis 3:22; Romans 5:12; Romans 6:23; Ephesians 2:1; 1 Timothy 5:6). Adam's sin was of consequence also to his descendants: "they inherited a fallen nature, and became the subjects of sin, and its penalty death." Paul distinctly states: "Through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned" (Romans 5:12). Again he said: "In Adam all die" (1 Corinthians 15:22). We may have different theories as to sin and its results; but we must not explain these texts away. The least they can mean (and they may mean much more than this) is that "all sinned in Adam as being in him. Adam, in committing his first sin, and as to its penalty, death, stood for and represented the whole of his posterity." As to the universality of sin and guilt, we have again the word of God: "There is none righteous, no, not one" (Romans 3:10). "There is no distinction; for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God" (Romans 3:22-23). The universal necessity of conversion, as taught in the Bible, is another proof (John 3:3; John 3:5), Man's Helpless Condition.

It was utterly beyond man's power to regain his primal state of innocence and communion with God. No one who has once sinned can in any way atone for that sin. He cannot make up by being specially good in other directions. We are told that "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all" (James 2:10). If a man perfectly kept God's law then and only then would he be beyond the need of pardon. "He that doeth them shall live in them" (Galatians 3:12); "Cursed is every one who continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them" (Galatians 3:10). Now, no mere man: ever thus perfectly kept God's law. 'All have sinned' (Romans 3:22), and so, "by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight" (Romans 3:20). Man's own efforts being thus excluded as of no avail, we are limited to one way of justification. God must pardon if man is to be saved. Interposition must come from the divine side. The sinner can not say how and on what terms he shall be saved. The rebel cannot compel his insulted King to receive him, or dictate the terms of peace. No one can atone for his own or his brother's sin: "None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him" (Psalms 49:7). Salvation, says Paul, is "not of yourselves" and "not of works" (Ephesians 2:8-9). "Salvation is of the Lord." Death is the wages of sin; the eternal life, if it is ever ours, must be the free gift of God (Romans 6:23). We have, then, God's Remedy for Sin.

As soon as man sinned, God foretold the coming victory over sin and the author of it. To the serpent, the Lord God said: I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed: he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" (Genesis 3:15). The application of this can hardly be limited to the natural antipathy existing between men and serpents! We have thus early in human history set forth the great conflict between the Christ (the true seed of the woman) and Satan. The Savior would come to destroy the works of the devil (1 John 3:8). He would crush the head of Satan, i.e., inflict fatal injury, break his power over man. Yet he himself would be bruised and hurt, but not fatally "Satan bruised Christ's heel in Gethsemane and on the cross but Jesus Christ gained the victory over Satan, and will utterly defeat him." Jesus Christ, the Son of God, died for the sins of men on the cross of Calvary. What could not be attained by works comes to us: by grace (Romans 4:4; Romans 11:6). The salvation which we

cannot have as wages comes as a gift (Ephesians 2:8). It is not essential or here desirable to enter upon theories of the atonement. It is necessary to notice some of the things which the Scriptures say as to our redemption. The Bible statements are all we know of the matter. How the death of Jesus availed to save may be beyond our comprehension, the fact is the clearest and most blessed in the Bible. The Son of God, leaving the glory which he had with the Father before the world was (John 17:5), came to earth, assumed the form of a servant, perfectly obeyed the law which man failed to keep, and became obedient unto death. Holy, harmless, undefiled, he made sacrifice of himself (Hebrews 7:26-27). Men are redeemed "with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ" (1 Peter 1:18-19). Christ "died for our sins" (1 Corinthians 15:3). He "his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree" (1 Peter 2:24). "The Son of man came ... to give his life a ransom for many" (Matthew 20:28). "There is one God, one Mediator also between God and men himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for ail" (1 Timothy 2:5-6). "He tasted death for every man" (Hebrews 2:9). "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world" (1 John 2:2). He was made sin for us (2 Corinthians 5:21). He became a curse for us, and hence redeemed us from the curse of the law (Galatians 3:13-14). His blood cleanseth from all sin (1 John 1:7). We are "justified by his blood" (Romans 5:9). We are "reconciled to God through the death of his Son" (Romans 5:10). These facts, and not any human theory as to these facts are what we steadfastly believe and teach. There seems to be some need for a special emphasis of three points: (1) The death of Jesus for the world's sin was not an after thought. We have seen the promise given as soon as sin was committed (Genesis 3:15). Christ's sufferings were ordained in eternal purpose. If men by wicked hands did crucify and slay the Son of God, he was also "delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" (Acts 2:23). He was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Revelation 13:8) . (2) We must beware of speaking and thinking of God's work in our redemption in such a way as to imply that the Father was an angry God who needed to be reconciled and appeased in order that he might love mankind. The Bible on the contrary, so far from teaching that the Son's death won over the Father to love the world, declares that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son" (John 3:16). "God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Romans 5:8). "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself" (2 Corinthians 5:19). We do not need to beseech the Father to be reconciled to men: "We beseech you, on behalf of Christ, he ye reconciled to God" (2 Corinthians 5:20). Let us hold no view of the atonement which is incompatible with these great texts. (3) As little, however should we disregard the plain fact that the justice, of God, and the majesty of his law land Person, had to be considered in the provision of a remedy for sin. That sin was no light thing is seen in this, that only the blood of the Son of God was in value precious enough to redeem. The claims of justice were satisfied, and God's law magnified, in the atoning death of Christ. We rightly speak of the cross of Christ as the "trysting-place where heaven's love and heaven's justice meet." Consider one passage, Romans 3:24-26, specially the clause "that he might himself be just and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." Justice alone would condemn all sinners; mercy alone might pass over sin. But justice and mercy are troth exalted in the justifying of the man who believes in the Son of God as Savior. While the death of Jesus is to us the highest exhibition of divine love, and results in winning our love and turning us from a life of sin to a life of righteousness, yet none of the "moral influence" theories of the atonement are adequate. One important question is suggested by Romans 3:1-31. If God could only he shown to be just in

forgiving such a man and on such a condition, what becomes of the man who rejects the Savior? He has shut himself off from hope. He has spurned God's love, and rejected the plan which justice as well as love devised for his salvation. No man will stand justified before the throne of God at last, save on the ground that the Father has accepted him through the atoning sacrifice of Jesus our Savior.

QUESTIONS.

1. When and how did Sin come into the world? 2. Who was the tempter of our first parents? 3. What is sin? 4. Do we sin against man or God? (Give texts in proof). 5. What were the results of Adam's sin to himself? 6. (a) Are we in any ways affected by Adam's sin? (b) If so, how? 7. What is God's remedy for sin? 8. Are there any men who do not need a Savior? (Give texts). 9. For whom did Christ die? 10. Would one sin condemn a man? or could he make up for it by later holy conduct? 11. Explain Genesis 3:15. 12. Do you think it is a fair representation of the atonement to say that Christ appeased in his death the wrath of a just and angry God? Refer in your answer to the Scripture teaching.

02.05. JESUS CHRIST - 01 - His Person

JESUS CHRIST – 01 – His Person Reading. Matthew 16:13-20.

Golden Text. And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.--Matthew 16:16.

Daily Readings. Mark 4:1-11; Php 2:5-11; John 1:1-34; Hebrews 1:1-14; Mark 9:1-10;

2 Peter 1:16-18; Acts 2:22-36; Hebrews 9:11-28.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

WHEN we deal with a subject sacred, and in some respects mysterious as this, it is well that we do not seem or seek to be wise above that which is written. We must particularly remember that our inquiry has to do with what is revealed in the Bible about the Person of Jesus our Lord. It is most desirable that in teaching the lesson close adherence be made to Scriptural statements. It is all-important that we believe what the Bible says concerning the Christ; it is not so necessary that we decide as to the speculations of men. Again, it has constantly to be borne in mind that while the facts, as facts, are plainly stated and easily accepted, the modes of these facts are beyond our comprehension. The burden of our study of the person of Jesus is simply that he was truly man and as truly God. We believe that this can easily be shown from the Scriptures. It will be no cogent reply or valid objection to say that we do not know how he could possess in one person a human and a divine nature. The youngest child in your class can accept the fact; the wisest Christian philosopher cannot explain the union of natures, or tell us more of the Son's relationship to the Father than the Scriptures state.

1. The Manhood of Christ.

Since practically none to-day deny the true humanity of Jesus, it will be unnecessary to dwell long here. We know that in the early centuries of our era some heretical sects (as the Gnostics, Apollinarians, and some others) did deny this. The Apostle John condemned Gnostic theories as to our Lord not being a man, but only a phantom or temporary manifestation of the Godhead (see 1 John 4:1-3; 2 John 1:7). None hold such views now. Yet one will often hear statements made as to the sufferings; and especially the temptations of the Savior, which practically amount to an ignoring of his humanity. We may note, then, a few things concerning the "man Christ Jesus" (1 Timothy 2:5). Miraculously conceived, Jesus was yet born as other babies are. As other children he increased in wisdom and stature (Luke 2:52). He hungered (Matthew 4:2), thirsted (John 4:7), was wearied (John 4:6), slept (Matthew 8:24) had flesh and bones (Luke 24:39); wept (John 11:35); shrank instinctively from suffering (Luke 12:50; Luke 22:42); died (John 19:30). He had the feelings of men: he loved (John 11:5), was angry (John 2:15), wondered (Luke 7:9), suffered agony (Luke 22:44); he needed help through prayer (Luke 22:41), and received heavenly strength (Luke 22:43). He endured the temptations of men. These trials are especially worthy of notice. We are told that he is "one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are" (Hebrews 4:15). This proves his true humanity, but it does more. It helps to make him a perfect and sympathetic Savior: "In that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted"

(Hebrews 2:18). The one point of difference here is that of sinlessness. He was tempted as we, "yet without sin" (Hebrews 4:15; John 8:46).

2. The Godhood of Christ.

"The divinity of Christ is the corner-stone of our faith. We do not, we cannot, put our trust in man--our faith is in God." Jesus had a truly human nature, yet was as truly divine. We have the two natures in one person. Some striking sets of passages, showing the blending, can be given. Jesus, we read, "advanced in wisdom" (Luke 2:52); but the same chapter previously represented him as "filled with wisdom" (Luke 2:40), and John said he was full of truth (John 1:14). He claimed only God as his Father (Luke 2:49), yet went to Nazareth and was subject to Joseph and Mary (Luke 2:51). John says, "He needed not that anyone should bear witness concerning man; for he himself knew what was in man's" (John 2:25), yet "he marvelled" at the centurion's faith (Matthew 8:10), and also at the people's unbelief (Mark 6:6). 1. Jesus is repeatedly called the Son of God (Matthew 3:17, etc.). Now, because men are in the Bible called sons of God (Galatians 4:6) or children of God (1 John 3:1), some have suggested that there is no true divinity implied in the Sonship of Jesus. But Jesus is "the Son" (Matthew 16:16), the "only begotten Son" (John 3:16). See Hebrews 1:8, "Of the Son" he saith, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." Could this be said of one who was only a man? The Jews took Jesus' claim to be the Son of God as blasphemy (John 19:7). They would have been right, if he had only been man; they were wrong, because his God-head made the claim true. It is most significant that Jesus never in any sense qualified the words "Son of God" so as to remove the implication of divinity. Again, it has to be noted how Jesus carefully guarded against the suggestion that he was a Son as the disciples were, see John 20:17, "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." 2. We have other divine titles used of the Christ. He was foretold as "The Mighty God" (Isaiah 9:6). He is Immanuel, "God with us" (Matthew 1:23). "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God ... The Word became flesh and dwelt among us" (John 1:1; John 1:14). Thomas greeted him as "My Lord and my God"; and Jesus, so far from rejecting the title, said: "Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (John 20:28-29). He is called "God" in Hebrews 1:8, and "true God" in 1 John 5:20. Of his great name, "Jehovah," the Lord said, "I am Jehovah, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another" (Isaiah 42:8); again: "Thou alone whose name is Jehovah art the Most High over all the earth" (Psalms 83:18). Now this great name is applied to our Lord Jesus. In Isaiah 40:3 we read, "The voice of one that crieth, Prepare ye in the wilderness the way of Jehovah", in Matthew 3:1-3 that prophecy is quoted of John the Baptist's preparing the way of Jesus. In Isaiah 6:1-13 we read of the wonderful vision of God - Adonai (v. 1) and "Jehovah of Hosts" (v. 5)--which the prophet had. Now the Apostle John definitely states that Isaiah saw "his glory and spake of him," and "his" and "him" refer to Jesus (John 12:36-41).

3. We have the prerogatives of God ascribed to Jesus Christ.

(a) He is presented as Creator (John 1:1-3; Colossians 1:16)

(b) God only is the proper object of worship, as Jesus himself declared, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve" (Matthew 4:10). Yet we find Jesus worshipped by men and angels (John 9:38; Acts 7:54-60; Php 2:9-11; Hebrews 1:6; Revelation 5:9-13).

(c) God alone can forgive sin. Jesus Christ forgave sin at will (Luke 5:18-25) and gave to others authority to promise pardon on his conditions (John 20:22-23; Mark 16:15-16).

(d) He will raise the dead and judge the world (Matthew 25:31-33; John 5:22-29; Romans 14:10; 2 Corinthians 5:10).

4. The passages which plainly assert the pre-existence of Christ should be noted. "The Word" who "became flesh" was "in the beginning" with God and was himself God (John 1:1-14). The Lord Jesus said, "Before Abraham was I am" (John 8:58). He had a glory with the Father before the world was (John 17:5). The Father loved him "before the foundation of the world" (John 17:24) 5. We have statements as to his equality and oneness with God the Father. "I and the Father are one" (John 10:30). The Savior was so conscious of this oneness that he declared "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (John 14:9). Men are to honor the Son as they honor the Father (John 5:23). The foregoing series of texts are only explicable on a belief in the true deity of the Lord Jesus. No mere man could truly speak or be spoken of as above. We may accept the words of him who was God manifest in the flesh (1 Timothy 3:16), in whom dwelt "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Colossians 2:9). It may be noticed that there are texts which imply a subordination of the Son to the Father. The Father "sent" the Son (John 3:16), and gave him power (Matthew 28:18). Once Jesus said, "The Father is greater than I" (John 14:28). The last verse has sometimes been misused so as, to neutralise the claim to equality with God in John 10:30, and to show that Jesus was but a man. But only think of the superfluity and absurdity involved in the supposition that a mere man deemed it necessary to tell folk that God in his heaven was greater than he! We reverently accept all that is revealed, though we cannot presume to understand the mystery of the Godhead.

02.06. JESUS CHRIST - 02 - His Office

JESUS CHRIST – 02 – His Office

There are in the Bible many different titles expressive of the work of Jesus our Lord He is our Advocate (1 John 2:1), the Author And Perfecter of our faith (Hebrews 12:2), the Author of eternal salvation (Hebrews 5:9), the Christ (Matthew 16:16), Counsellor (Isaiah 9:6), the Deliverer (Ram. 11:26), King of Israel (John 1:49), Mediator (1 Timothy 2:5), Priest (Hebrews 5:6), High Priest (Hebrews 5:10), Prophet (Deuteronomy 18:15; Luke 24:19) Redeemer (Isaiah 59:20; Galatians 3:13); Savior (Acts 5:31); Shepherd (Hebrews 13:20; 1 Peter 5:4). Most of these titles sufficiently explain themselves. We need only notice in further detail few of them. 1. Mediator.--A mediator is one who interposes between two parties between whom there is variance, with a view to effecting a reconciliation between them. "A mediator is not a mediator of one" (Galatians 3:20). In the New Testament the word is used once of Moses who was the mediator of the law (Galatians 3:19; cf. Deuteronomy 5:5); elsewhere it is applied to Jesus the Mediator of the new and better covenant (Hebrews 8:6; Hebrews 9:15; Hebrews 12:24). The problem is, How is man when once he has sinned to approach the Infinite, Holy and Righteous God? He personally has not the right of direct approach. He needs a mediator. "In all ages, and in all parts of the world, there has constantly prevailed such a sense of the holiness of the Supreme Divinity, as to make recourse to some sort of mediator universal. There is not a form of religion known, even among the savages and heathen nations, which does not recognise, with more or less distinctness, the necessity of a mediator between the Divinity and man." The mediation of Christ is connected with his sacrificial death: "For this cause he is the mediator of the new covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance" (Hebrews 9:15). The mediatorial office of Christ is also connected with his work as High Priest. In the Old Covenant, the High Priest alone had the right of entry into the Holy of Holies on the great annual day of Atonement (Hebrews 9:7; this high priest was a type of Jesus (Hebrews 9:11-12). Again, we have in Jesus the One with perfect qualifications for the work of mediation. "The natures of the offended and the offending parties meet in Him--God's fellow and man's brother. God's glory is dear to Him as God, man's interests are dear to him as Man." One of the great truths of the New Testament is that there is one mediator between God and men (1 Timothy 2:5). We must guard against putting any other in the place which rightfully belongs to Jesus. He is the only One who can effectively reconcile man to God. 2. Christ.--Jesus is "the Christ" or "the Messiah" (Matthew 16:16; John 1:41). The former phrase comes from the Greek the latter from the Hebrew; each means "the anointed." Jesus received the anointing from the Father. He, in the synagogue of Nazareth, quoted as fulfilled in His case the prophecy of Isaiah, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me," etc. (Luke 4:18). We cannot help connecting these words with the coming of the Spirit upon Him at His baptism (Luke 3:21-22). So Geikie, in his "Life and Words of Christ," speaks of the baptism as "the formal consecration which marked His entrance on His great office"; saying that He entered the waters "as Jesus, the Son of man; He rose from them, The Christ of God." Of old, it was the

custom to anoint men with oil, as a part of the ceremony of consecration to office; as kings (1 Samuel 10:1; 2 Samuel 5:3), prophets (1 Kings 19:16), priests (Leviticus 8:1-12). Jesus was not only anointed, He was "the anointed" of God, set apart for a holy office. He fulfills in His own Person the three-fold office of King, Prophet, and Priest, which we may profitably notice.

3. King.--That the Messiah would be King not only was the universal belief of the Jews, but was clearly foretold in the Scriptures. E.g., Psalms 2:1-12, which is in the New Testament used as prophesying the Messiah (Hebrews 1:5), says, "I have set my King upon my holy hill of Zion." The Jews of Jesus' day knew of such prophecies, but misunderstood the method of their fulfillment. They would have made Jesus forcibly King of an earthly kingdom (John 6:15). Jesus before Pilate said that His kingdom was not of this world (John 18:36-37). That Jesus is now a King is clear from the New Testament. Both he and John the Baptist proclaimed that the "Kingdom of God" or "Kingdom of heaven" was "at hand" (Matthew 3:2; Matthew 4:17). Jesus gave us a terminal date when He said explicitly, "There be some of them that stand here which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom" (Matthew 16:28). Unless one of the apostles has not yet died, I have no option but to believe that the Son of man has a kingdom. Later in the New Testament, we read of Jesus as highly exalted (Php 2:9), "far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come," with "all things in subjection under his feet" (Ephesians 1:20-22). We read of Him as "crowned" (Hebrews 2:9), and we are explicitly told that Christians have been translated into the kingdom of the Son of His Love (Colossians 1:13). A kingdom implies a king, and Christ has a kingdom.

4. Prophet.--A prophet speaks forth the things of God. Christ is the great revealer of God, His attributes and His will (Matthew 11:27). God who spoke in times past unto the fathers by the prophets hath at the end of the days spoken unto us in His Son (Hebrews 1:1-2). Jesus is definitely called a prophet; the words of Moses, "Jehovah thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken" (Deuteronomy 18:15), are in the New Testament quoted and applied to the Lord Jesus (Acts 3:22; Acts 7:37).

5. Priest.--The letter to the Hebrews tells us much of the priesthood of Jesus. The high priests of the Old Covenant were types of our great High Priest. Our Priest, as Aaron, was divinely appointed (Hebrews 5:4-5), and qualified by temptation, suffering and human sympathy to be High Priest (Hebrews 4:15; Hebrews 2:17-18). Jesus is repeatedly contrasted with the Aaronic priesthood. "The priests of the Jewish faith were sinful men (Hebrews 5:3), while Jesus was absolutely sinless (Hebrews 4:15). They were mortal creatures, 'many in number, because that by death they are hindered from continuing' (Hebrews 7:23) while Jesus 'abideth for ever,, and so 'hash his priesthood unchangeable' (Hebrews 7:24). The sacrifices of the Jewish law were imperfect (Hebrews 10:1 ff); but Christ 'by one offering hath perfected for ever them that are being sanctified' (Hebrews 10:14). The sanctuary of the old religion was a worldly structure (Hebrews 9:1), and so liable to destruction or decay, but Christ enters 'into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us' (Hebrews 9:24)." Every high priest must have somewhat to offer (Hebrews 8:3); Jesus offered up himself (Hebrews 9:14)--a sacrifice which, as against the doctrines of some to-day who would exalt a priestly class above their fellows, we are told will never be repeated; it was "once for all" (Hebrews 7:27; Hebrews 9:28; Hebrews 10:10). It should be most particularly noted that, save in the sense in which all Christians are priests (1 Peter 2:5; 1 Peter 2:9), we have no priest but Jesus Christ. We need no other man to stand between us and God; Christ is the "one mediator" (1 Timothy 2:5), through whom we have access to the Father (Ephesians 2:18). With the priestly

offering of Himself, and "in virtue of it, Jesus entered into the presence of God (Hebrews 9:24), as the 'mediator of a new covenant' (Hebrews 9:15), and the ever-living Intercessor (Hebrews 7:25), and so secured for us our access with boldness unto the throne of grace (Hebrews 4:16; Hebrews 10:13-22)." This intercessory office of the Lord Jesus, though we cannot comprehend it, is yet plainly revealed, and is gratefully accepted by the believer as one of the most blessed works of Jesus on our behalf. When we sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous (1 John 2:1). It is a glorious thought that our feeble petitions for grace, blessing and pardon, do not come alone to God. The Spirit helps our infirmity and makes intercession for the saints according to the will of God (Romans 8:26-27), and we learn, too, the present work of Jesus on our behalf: "He ever liveth to make intercession for them" who draw near unto God through Him (Hebrews 7:25).

QUESTIONS.

1. What proofs would you give of our Lord's true humanity? 2. Was Jesus altogether like other men? If not, indicate the difference. 3. Name some titles of Jesus which imply His divinity. 4. How would you reply to one who said that the Bible meant us to believe in Jesus as a son of God in the sense in which we are sons? 5. Do the Scriptures declare the pre-existence of Christ Jesus ere he walked this earth? 6. What divine prerogatives are ascribed to the Lord Jesus? 7. Name six titles used to denote the office of Christ. 8. Write a note on the word "Christ." How was Jesus the Christ? 9. Why is Jesus called a Mediator? 10. What do you know of Jesus as King? 11. What has Jesus as Priest done for us? 12. What is Jesus doing for us now?

02.07. THE HOLY SPIRIT - 01 - The Work of Inspiration

THE HOLY SPIRIT – 01 – The Work of Inspiration Reading. Acts 1:4-9 and Acts 2:1-4.

Golden Text. Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.--Zechariah 4:6.

Daily Readings. 1 Corinthians 12:1-11; Joel 2:28-32; Acts 10:44-48; Matthew 3:11-17; 2 Peter 1:19-21; 2 Timothy 3:16; John 16:7-15; Acts 8:5-24.

Introductory.

BEFORE we enquire into the work of the Holy Spirit, a brief preliminary study should be made of Him whose work we wish to notice. In our English Bibles we have the names "Spirit" and "Ghost" used indiscriminately as the translation of the same word. Since the word "Ghost" has now other and inharmonious meaning and associations, we prefer to use invariably the word "Spirit." (See margin of R.V., Matthew 1:18.) We have various titles of the Spirit in the Bible. He is "the Holy Spirit" (Matthew 3:11, etc.), because he is pure and purifying, "the Spirit," simply (Matthew 4:1); the Spirit of Christ (Romans 8:9), the Spirit of the Son of God (Galatians 4:6), being sent forth by Christ; the Spirit of God (Romans 8:9); the Spirit of the Father (Matthew 10:20), the Spirit of the Lord (Luke 4:18); the good Spirit (Nehemiah 9:20); the Spirit of grace (Hebrews 10:29), He alone having revealed the grace of God in Christ Jesus, the Spirit of truth (John 14:17), the Spirit of life (Romans 8:2); the Comforter (or better "the Paraclete," Advocate, i.e., the invoked Helper of the soul, John 16:7). It must be noted at the outset that we have to deal with the work of a Person and a Divine Person, not merely with a holy influence or disposition of God and Christ. That personality may be predicated of the Holy Spirit is clear from many passages of Scripture. Some have been somewhat misled through a misuse of the truth that the word for Spirit (pneuma) is neuter, and means "breath," and so cannot of itself indicate personality. But a careful reading of Christ's great address in John, John 14:1-31, John 15:1-27, John 16:1-33, shows that Jesus speaks of the Spirit as a Person. There, e.g., we find masculine pronouns used, though pneuma is neuter (see John 15:26; John 16:7-8). Again, consciousness and personal action are attributed to the Spirit. He can teach (1 Corinthians 2:13), speak (Acts 10:19-20), help (Romans 8:26); comfort (Acts 9:31); intercede (Romans 8:26), knows the things of God (1 Corinthians 2:11). We can, grieve the Holy Spirit (Ephesians 4:30). It would not make sense to apply the words of Matthew 12:31-32 to an influence. The Spirit is Divine. He is omniscient (1 Corinthians 2:10), omnipresent (Psalms 139:7) Creator (Psalms 104:30), Eternal (Hebrews 9:14). Peter said Ananias lied to the Holy Spirit, and continued, "Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God (Acts 5:4) In 2 Corinthians 3:16-17 we read, "The Lord is the Spirit." In Isaiah 6:9-10 we have a verse which is quoted by Paul in Acts 28:25-27, with the introduction, "Well spoke the Holy Spirit through Isaiah the prophet " In Isaiah 6:8-9, we learn that it was "the voice of the Lord" which the prophet heard. Since the Holy Spirit is sent by the Son (John 16:7) we must in some way reverently believe in a subordination of the work of the Spirit to that of the Son, just as in the case of the Son's work with reference to the Father. The Son was divine, yet he could say, "The Father is greater than I" (John 14:28). We believe in one God, but in harmony with Scripture we must declare that Father, Son and Holy Spirit are Divine

Persons. Matthew 28:19 settles the question of the divinity of the Holy Spirit--"baptising them into the name ["not names"] of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." In connection with the extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit's power, we have first to notice The Work of Inspiration.

"Inspiration" comes from a verb meaning, "to breathe into." We speak of the men who were used by God to write the books of the Bible as inspired rather than of their works as inspired, though in an accommodated sense we can speak of the writings as themselves inspired. We have already in the first lesson, in stating the Bible's claim to be God's Word, said some things which could appear under the heading of "inspiration." Here we shall notice some Scriptural statements as to the Spirit's work in this direction. Many men are said to have been speaking the words of the Spirit, from whom we have no books. For instance, Zacharias was filled with the Spirit and prophesied (Luke 1:67-79). So Stephen (Acts 7:55), Agabus (Acts 21:11). See also Numbers 24:2; Judges 3:10; 2 Chronicles 15:1, etc. The apostles of Jesus Christ were promised this inspiration. Jesus told them: "When they deliver you up, be not anxious how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you" (Matthew 10:19-20; cf. Mark 13:11; Luke 21:12-15). Later, this promise of the Spirit's guidance was extended beyond help in answering the charges of adversaries: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he the Spirit of truth is come, he shall guide you into all the truth" (see John 16:12-15; John 14:15-18). Now, we have ten books of the New Testament written by the apostles to whom these promises were spoken; so we have Scriptural authority for the inspiration of the writers of these. In the case of the Apostle Paul, converted after the other apostles had been commissioned, to whom we owe thirteen or fourteen of the books of the New Testament, we have the witness of the Apostle Peter that Paul wrote "according to the wisdom given to him" (2 Peter 3:15). In addition we have some most instructive words from Paul himself, which require special notice and throw clear light on what inspiration means. Read carefully 1 Corinthians 2:4-16; 1 Corinthians 14:37; Ephesians 3:1-7; 1 Thessalonians 2:13. We can quote but these "Unto us God revealed them through the Spirit"; "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth." In the New Testament, too, we have a number of most significant statements regarding the inspiration of the Old Testament books. Peter, for example, says, in reference to the prophets of old, "No prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Peter 1:21; cf. 1 Peter 1:8-10). This is in harmony with what Paul said of the Old Testament Scriptures as a whole: "Thou hast known the sacred writings, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. Every Scripture inspired of God is profitable for teaching," etc. (2 Timothy 3:15-16). Theories as to inspiration abound but we are not warranted in asking men to accept our theories. We are much more concerned with getting people to believe the claims which the writers of the Bible themselves make than to agree to our views of how the Spirit of God inspired these men. These writers received special revelations of things before unknown to them; they were guided in their ideas and choice of words; and they wrote in all things according to the will of God. Nothing less than this can possibly satisfy the requirements of the case. Personally I should say that inspiration - implies "the personal presence in the inspired of the Holy Spirit; the communication to his mind of ideas, selecting the words in which these ideas, shall be spoken and written." Nothing less than this last can be claimed in the case of Matthew 10:19-20 and 1 Corinthians 2:13. This inspiration of the Bible writers did not do away with the distinctive style of each writer. The Holy Spirit did and could use and work through men of different

temperament and style. The fact that we have the sayings of Satan and wicked men recorded in the Bible is sometimes urged as an objection. "Are these inspired?" we are asked. Clearly not; but it is no objection. We simply say that the writers of the books which contain the narrative were inspired. The record is a true one. The Holy Spirit inspired holy men to give a faithful account of even the evil deeds of men and the beguiling words of Satan, for our instruction and warning. Inspiration is not affirmed of men who copied or translated our Scriptures. We only claim that the authors were inspired in their work. Have we inspiration to-day as the apostles had? We have no evidence of such a thing. We believe that when the last apostle to whom Jesus gave the promise of the Spirit's help in utterance and recollection died, this work of inspiration ceased. Many to-day claim to speak the Spirit's words, but, alas, they often contradict the word which the Spirit spoke nineteen centuries ago. We prefer to believe that they err in their claim rather than allow for a moment that God's Holy Spirit can contradict Himself. We would also naturally ask that the alleged inspired man of to-day should be able to work miracles in proof of his claim as were the inspired apostles. We know of none possessing this power. We are sure, too, that in the Scriptures we have enough given for the man of God to be "complete, furnished completely unto every good work."

02.08. THE HOLY SPIRIT - 02 - Spiritual Gifts

THE HOLY SPIRIT – 02 – Spiritual Gifts

We read in the New Testament of a large number of special gifts being bestowed upon different Christians. These endowments are called by Paul "spiritual gifts" (1 Corinthians 12:1). A reading of Romans 12:6-8; 1 Corinthians 12:7-11; 1 Corinthians 12:28-30; 1 Corinthians 14:1-18, is recommended. Many non-miraculous endowments which we possess--traits of character, mental and spiritual qualities--may fittingly be called gifts of God and of His Spirit. But it is evident from the above passages that certain miraculous gifts were bestowed in the early church on other than apostles. We have the gift of speaking with tongues, the gift of interpreting these tongues (by another than the one speaking with the tongue), gifts of healing, gifts of prophecy, working of miracles, or "powers," as exorcism (Acts 16:18; Acts 19:11-12). We have the intimation that such gifts were transmitted on the laying on of apostolic hands (2 Timothy 1:6). Acts 8:14-19 bears this out. It seems that Philip, not an apostle, had no power to pass on the gifts, hence Peter and John laid hands on the Samaritans. Simon Magus prayed, not for the gifts, but that the apostles would grant to him their power of transmitting the gifts (Acts 8:19). Such gifts must be distinguished from "the gift of the Holy Spirit" promised to the obedient believer (Acts 2:38). This we shall deal with in next lesson. The Samaritans in Acts 8:1-40 had already complied with the conditions of receiving the Holy Spirit, and the Corinthians had the Spirit dwelling in them (1 Corinthians 3:16). But both Samaritans and Corinthians received in addition special manifestations of the Spirit. These miraculous powers were peculiarly fitted to corroborate the message of the gospel in its first great conflict with the hosts of evil. Evidence is [asking that such gifts are at our disposal to-day.

02.09. THE HOLY SPIRIT - 03 - Baptism in the Holy Spirit;

THE HOLY SPIRIT – 03 – Baptism in the Holy Spirit;

In the Gospels and Acts we read of the "baptism in the Holy Spirit." John the Baptist foretold that Christ would so baptize (Matthew 3:11, Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33). The Lord Jesus on the day of his ascension said to his apostles, "Ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence" (Acts 1:5). We have the expression used again in Acts 11:16, when Peter associated the coming of the Spirit upon Cornelius and his household with the Baptist's prophecy. These six passages are the only ones in which the phrase "baptized in the Holy Spirit" occurs in the Bible. The phrase "baptized in the Holy Spirit" is clearly a metaphorical one; used to denote the fact that, just as in immersion a man is overwhelmed, so the Spirit took full possession of covered, overwhelmed the man who is said to be "baptized." We have only two recorded instances of such baptism in the New Testament. Men have imagined others, but it is indisputable that only two cases are definitely indicated as baptisms in the Holy Spirit. These examples are: the apostles on Pentecost (Acts 2:1-14) in fulfillment of the Savior's explicit word (Acts 1:5); and Cornelius and his household (Acts 10:44-46), of which Peter said, "The Holy Spirit fell on them, even as on us at the beginning," and which he declared reminded him of John's promise (Acts 11:15-16). We do not think those men are right to-day who proclaim the necessity of this Holy Spirit baptism and who sometimes indeed make it the one essential thing. We simply point to the clear facts:-- (1) No one was ever commanded to be baptized in the Holy Spirit.

(2) Only two certain cases of its occurrence are recorded, each of which shows special features and reasons which we do not find in alleged modern cases:

(a) Miraculous signs followed (Acts 2:4; Acts 10:46). These are not exhibited in the case of present-day claimants'

(b) The baptism and its miraculous effects were used as the apostles' credentials to convince the unbelieving Jews, and, in Cornelius's case, to convince dull-minded Christians that God was willing to receive Gentiles into the church on the same terms with Jews (see Acts 10:45; Acts 11:17-18). This special need does not now exist.

(c) Paul has told us, "There is . . . one baptism" (Ephesians 4:5). This was unquestionably the baptism commanded by Jesus (Matthew 28:19). That the Holy Spirit baptism neither came in the place of nor rendered unnecessary baptism in water in the name of Christ is conclusively proved by the simple fact (which the Holy Spirit has apparently recorded to keep men from being misled) that after Cornelius and his house were baptized in the Holy Spirit, the Apostle Peter said: "Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?" and then "he commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 10:47-48) .

It is clear that many persons to-day, when they speak of the "baptism in the Holy Spirit," mean the filling of the Spirit which is referred to by Paul in Ephesians 5:18. We shall see in next lesson that

an Christians have the Spirit dwelling in them and are exhorted to be "filled with the Spirit." We can but plead that men will call Bible things by Bible names; it clearly cannot be proved that Ephesians 5:18 has to do with the baptism in the Holy Spirit. The words of W. C. Morro in his little book on "God's Spirit and the Spirit's Work" are so pertinent here that I close with them: "I candidly believe that the religious world has made the scope of baptism in the Holy Spirit far too extensive. Nowhere ill God's Word is a man taught to pray for it. Nowhere are we told that it will bring a man into Christ. Sins are not forgiven on being baptized into it. No conditions are laid down by which a man may receive it. It is never held out as a promise to the church. We are never told that men who receive it will have a closer walk with God. In short, every consideration convinces us that it was designed to serve a temporary purpose. Having accomplished that, it ceased, and we should not lament its loss."

QUESTIONS.

1. Give some of the titles of the Holy Spirit and mention their significance.
2. State reasons for believing in the personality of the Spirit.
3. What is meant by inspiration?
4. Did the New Testament writers claim to be inspired? Give some proofs.
5. What are the advantages of having inspired Scriptures?
6. Name some "spiritual gifts."
7. For what purpose were they given?
8. Do you think these were temporary or permanent? Give reasons.
9. When was the baptism in the Holy Spirit first bestowed, and who received it?
10. Who else received the baptism in the Holy Spirit?
11. Why was it called a "baptism"?
12. What miraculous effect followed in these cases?

02.10. THE HOLY SPIRIT - 04 - The Spirit's Work in Conversion

THE HOLY SPIRIT – 04 – The Spirit’s Work in Conversion Reading. John 16:7-15.

Golden Text. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; Even the Spirit of Truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.--John 14:16-17.

Daily Readings. John 7:37-40; Romans 2:9-16; Acts 8:26-39; Ezekiel 36:25-30; Galatians 5:16-26; 1 Corinthians 2:6-16; 2 Corinthians 3:6-18.

IN this second study on the Holy Spirit, we have to consider the abiding and continuous work of the Spirit of God in the conversion of sinners and the sanctification of Christians. There could scarcely be a more important theme. The Spirit’s Work in Conversion.

Conversion is essential to discipleship, pardon, entrance into the kingdom, life eternal. Men must turn from sin to serve the living God. Jesus told his disciples, "Except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 18:3). The greatness of the change is such that Jesus referred to it as a birth from above (John 3:3; John 3:5), and Paul to it as a "new creation" (2 Corinthians 5:17, R.V. Margin). Men, before "dead" through trespasses and sins (Ephesians 2:1), are "quicken" or made alive (Ephesians 2:1; Ephesians 2:5). This turning to God may be looked at from two points of view.

(a) The man must turn, it is his act. The common version in Matthew 18:3 and Acts 3:19, in using the passive voice, "be converted," obscures man’s activity. The Revised Version rightly has "turn," showing the human action. We can gather from the very responsibility of man that he is capable of obeying God’s voice. God would not condemn a sinner for not turning if it were not in man’s power to turn.

(b) We may also look at the work of conversion from another view. We may consider what God, or the Spirit of God, does in bringing a sinner to himself. The common consent of Christendom is that the Spirit’s agency is imperatively necessary. Those dead through trespasses are made alive by God (Ephesians 2:1-5). "No man," said Jesus, "can come to me, except the Father that sent me draw him" (John 6:44). Peter said, "Unto you first God, having raised up his Servant, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities" (Acts 3:26). Jesus said of the Holy Spirit, "He, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more, of judgment, because the prince of this world hath been judged" (John 16:8-11). We may use the words of Alexander Campbell, and say that we "could not esteem as of any value the religion of any man, as respects the grand affair of eternal life, whose religion is not begun, carried on, and completed by the personal agency of the Holy Spirit." This is quite in harmony with the Word of God. Man owes his salvation to God.

The fact that the Holy Spirit has a most important and essential work to do in the conversion of the sinner is clearly seen from the foregoing passages. We shall have to give some attention to the question, How is this work done? At the outset two passages must be noted, which will serve to clear out of the way some theories widely held. Our Lord Jesus, who said he would send the Spirit to his apostles, used these words: "The Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive" (John 14:17). The Apostle Paul, in harmony therewith, said: "Because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba Father" (Galatians 4:6). No statement which is out of harmony with these texts can be accepted as a satisfactory account of the Spirit's operation in conversion. All the views of conversion which presuppose the need of the Spirit's entrance into the heart of the sinner before his conversion are negatived. The best commentary on Jesus' words concerning the Spirit's convincing power (John 16:8-11) will be found in the accounts of conversion recorded in the New Testament. Since the Spirit inspired the narrator, we have His own account of His work. The very first gospel sermon (Acts 2:1-47) will serve for illustration. The Holy Spirit here furnished the preacher with his message. The apostles spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance (Acts 2:4). Peter in the course of his address refers to the Spirit's help (Acts 2:17-18; Acts 2:33). The result of the sermon was the conviction of many of sin; three thousand obeyed the gospel. Who convicted these men? Unquestionably of God, for He gave Peter utterance. In Acts 8:1-40 we have the story of the eunuch's conversion. The Spirit comes and works for that man's salvation. But He does not enter the seeker's heart. He goes to the preacher (Acts 8:29). The work of the Spirit here is to bring preacher and seeker together, so that the word may be preached. The Spirit does not directly tell the man he is saved, or even what to do to be saved. Jesus had committed the word of reconciliation to His disciples, and the Holy Spirit does not take that work out of the disciples' hands. In similar fashion the Lord Jesus, when, he personally appeared to Saul, did not tell him what to do to be saved, but left that work to a qualified disciple (Acts 9:10-17). We may learn from these Scriptures that the Holy Spirit did not so work as to dispense with the word of the gospel. These examples are quite in accord with Jesus' word to His apostles that they should be His witnesses (Acts 1:8), that the Holy Spirit should bear witness, (John 15:26), and speak of what things He had heard (John 16:13). They are also in accord with the parallelisms which might be cited, in which what is said to be done by the Spirit is said also to be done by the instrumentality of the Word. Jesus e.g., said a man must be born of the Spirit (John 3:5). Peter says we are "begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible through the word of God" (1 Peter 1:23). Paul says, "I begat you through the gospel" (1 Corinthians 4:15). Jesus, after saying that none can come to Him unless the Father draw him, shows the means of drawing used by the Father: "It is written in the prophets, And they shall all be taught of God. Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned cometh unto me" (John 6:45). The apostolic preachers spoke the word of the Spirit (see 1 Peter 1:12; 1 Thessalonians 1:5; 1 Corinthians 2:4, etc.); What work was done by that spoken word was therefore the work of the Spirit. Men were led to faith through hearing the word of God (Romans 10:17). We read of no conversions, either in apostolic days or in modern times, where the spoken or written word has not gone. True, the taking of the gospel to the heathen was opposed by some who said that if God wanted to save the heathen, He would do it without our agency. But we have learned that it is the entrance of God's word which giveth light (Psalms 119:130). Even those who now plead for the direct and immediate operation of the Spirit on the hearts of men send for able preachers in order to a big revival. We may learn that "to convert men by the accompanying influence of the Holy Spirit, we must do what

Paul commanded Timothy, 'Preach the word, be instant in season and out of season.'" We remember that "the word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Hebrews 4:12). The foregoing treatment is far from implying that the Word alone converts the sinner. We do not seek to separate speculatively Spirit and Word in their action. We rather believe that "it is the Spirit that quickens, and that the Word of God--the living Word--is that incorruptible seed which, when planted in the heart, vegetates, and germinates, and grows, and fructifies into life eternal"; and that it is unscriptural "to discriminate between spiritual agency and instrumentality--between the Word, per se, and the Spirit, per se, severally does, IS though they were two independent and wholly distinct powers or influences Let it also be distinctly understood that we have not said or implied that the Holy Spirit cannot act otherwise than as indicated. That would be a foolish thing to say. We have only sought to note from the Word of God what the Spirit has revealed as to His work. We have no desire and no warrant for discussing what He may or can do, save in so far as He has revealed it. Nor does the present article say anything against special providences or leadings of God. We have not been discussing these, but trying to see from the Bible what the Spirit says that He does in man's conversion.

02.11. THE HOLY SPIRIT - 05 - The Spirit's Work in Sanctification.

THE HOLY SPIRIT – 05 – The Spirit’s Work in Sanctification.

Things or persons which are set apart for God’s service are said to be sanctified. Aaron and his garments were sanctified (Leviticus 8:30). The altar and laver the tabernacle and its furniture, were sanctified (Exodus 40:9-10). Christ sanctified himself (John 17:10). Christians, as set apart for God’s service, as his peculiar possession, are sanctified. See 1 Corinthians 1:2; 1 Corinthians 6:11, etc. The words, "Ye were sanctified," imply that the sanctification was an accomplished thing. Christians as Christians are set apart, consecrated to God. But the New Testament looks also upon sanctification as a process still going on in the Christian. From the appropriately good and pure life which should be manifested by a man set apart, or sanctified, "sanctification" or "holiness" is used of this godly character. Sanctification is consequently urged upon Christians. Jesus asked that the disciples might be sanctified through the truth (John 17:17). Paul prayed, "The God of peace himself sanctify you wholly" (1 Thessalonians 5:23), Our sanctification is the will of God (1 Thessalonians 4:3). This sanctification is attributed to various things. The Father sanctifies (John 10:36; Jude 1:1); so does Jesus (Hebrews 13:12). We have "sanctification of the Spirit" (1 Peter 1:2) and "by the Holy Spirit" (Romans 15:16). As instruments we have--"the truth" (John 17:19), "faith" (Acts 26:18); "the Word of God" (1 Timothy 4:5); the will of God (Hebrews 10:10), the blood of Jesus (Hebrews 13:12). Finally, there is a command to be holy (1 Peter 1:18-19 - the adjective "holy" being a kindred word to the verb "sanctify"), so Christians have a part to do themselves. These passages do not contradict. We may not know so much as we would like to know concerning the process, but perhaps "the work is ascribed to God because he is the first cause of our salvation, to Christ, because he is the Savior, to his blood because it was the procuring cause of our separation unto God and the remission of sins' to the Word of God because it teaches us the will of God, to the Holy Spirit because he revealed the truth, to ourselves because we must apply the Spirit’s teaching." It would be quite inadequate to stop here. The Holy Spirit comes into a direct relationship with the Christian and influences him. We have a large number of passages which in the plainest fashion declare that the Holy Spirit dwells in the Christian. "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.- But if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Romans 8:9). The Christian’s body is "a temple of the Holy Spirit" (1 Corinthians 6:19; cf. 1 Corinthians 3:16). See also Romans 8:11; Romans 8:15; 2 Corinthians 1:22; 2 Corinthians 5:5; Galatians 3:2; Galatians 4:6; 1 Thessalonians 4:8; 2 Timothy 1:14; James 4:5; 1 John 4:13. What does the Holy Spirit do in and for us? The answer is found in part in the name "Comforter" or "Helper" applied to Him (John 14:16; cf. Acts 9:31); He comforts or strengthens us. Paul says the Spirit helps our infirmities, making intercession for us according to the win of God (Romans 8:26). What we owe to this help and intercession, we cannot fully know in this life. He strengthens us with power in the inward man (Ephesians 3:16). He sheds the love of God abroad in our hearts (Romans 5:5). With Him we have fellowship (2 Corinthians 13:14). In him we have joy (Romans 14:17). His presence produces as fruits the Christian graces--"love, joy, peace long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness temperance" (Galatians

5:22-23). How may we know that we have the Holy Spirit dwelling in us? There are two ways. Firstly, we notice the divine promise and the terms on which that promise is made. The world cannot receive the Spirit (John 14:17); sons of God have Him in their heart (Galatians 4:6). The "gift of the Holy Spirit is promised by Peter to the obedient penitent believer (Acts 2:38). The "gift, of the Holy Spirit" here is not simply some gift from the Spirit, but the Spirit as a gift, as Paul has it in 1 Thessalonians 4:8, God "giveth His Holy Spirit unto you." Those who have complied with the conditions of Acts 2:38 --conditions stated by the Spirit Himself--may be sure of the promise. In the second place the presence of the Spirit is attested by the fruits mentioned in Galatians 5:22-23. If these fruits are absent, the Spirit is not present. Have all Christians an equal share of the Spirit? Evidently not. Some are specially mentioned as being full of the Spirit (Acts 6:3). Christians are exhorted, "Be not drunken with wine, wherein is riot, but be filled with the Spirit" (Ephesians 5:18) . It becomes a pressing question in the light of the foregoing. How may we be more and more possessed of the Spirit? We reply that since the Holy Spirit was originally giver, to us upon obedience to God's truth, continued obedience to the Divine will is necessary. Again, we must give up sin, and strive to live a pure life. We must, as it were, give Him a larger habitation in our heart. He is not given to the world, and so those who cling to the things of the world cannot expect .& large measure of the Holy Spirit. Lastly, we are encouraged to pray for the Holy Spirit: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" (Luke 11:13). Perhaps in this, as in other cases, we have not because we ask not. At the close of our studies on the Holy Spirit, His miraculous and His ordinary manifestations, the practical question comes, "What is the highest manifestation of the Spirit?" Most of us have been tempted at times to long for radiant visions, audible expressions of Divine favor, faith, and power to work miracles, for some of the "spiritual gifts" possessed by the early Christians. Do not let us forget that we have something better than these. The godly life led by the help of the Spirit in His noblest product. We can get nothing better than "the fruits of the Spirit." Balaam prophesied by the Spirit of God, but he did not live a holy life, and "a little holiness is worth much illumination." Paul distinctly put love above the spiritual gifts; it is one of the Spirit's fruits, and is "a more excellent way" (1 Corinthians 12:2-31; 1 Corinthians 13:1-13; 1 Corinthians 14:1). God has given us the best, not the second best.

QUESTIONS.

1. What is meant by conversion?
2. What did Jesus say Holy Spirit would do when He came?
3. Who cannot receive the Holy Spirit?
4. Give New Testament example of the way in which the Holy Spirit works for the salvation of men.
5. Explain John 6:44. How does the Father draw men?
6. Do you think the Scriptures reveal the fact that the Spirit must come directly into the sinner's heart in order to his conversion?
7. What is meant by sanctification?
8. Name different things which are said in the Scriptures to be sanctified.
9. Who and what sanctify us?
10. What is the Spirit said to do for the Christian?
11. Prove by Scriptural references that the Spirit in the Christian.
12. What outward evidences should the Christian give of the indwelling of the Spirit?

02.12. FAITH - 01 - What is Faith?

FAITH – 01 – What is Faith?

Reading: James 2:14-26.

Golden Text. If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in shine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.--Romans 10:9.

Daily Readings. John 20:24-31; Romans 4:1-25; Matthew 16:13-20; Genesis 22:1-14; Matthew 8:5-13;

Romans 10:1-15; Hebrews 11:1-10.

WE have to deal with the foundation principle of the gospel of Christ, that without which all else is unavailing. Faith is the characteristic principle animating the Christian; so much so, that the beautiful description "believers" or "they that had believed" became a standing name for the followed of Christ (see Acts 2:44; Romans 10:4; 1 Corinthians 14:22; Acts 5:14; 1 Timothy 4:12). The word "faith" is used in the Bible in at least three distinct senses:

(a) We read of "the faith," when the religion of Jesus, the system of truth revealed by him, is meant. In Galatians 3:23, Paul says, "Before faith came, we were kept under the law" (common Version). But we know there was "faith" in pre-Christian times. The R. V. gives a better translation: "Before the faith came." See also Acts 6:7; Acts 13:8; Galatians 1:23; Jude 1:3.

(b) The word is used of the faithfulness or fidelity appropriate to believers, and required by the gospel. See Romans 1:8; Galatians 5:22; Titus 2:10.

(c) Generally a certain state of the mind is indicated by the word "faith.". It is with this third that we specially deal in his article. [It seems clear that the Greek substantive and the corresponding verb are at least as flexible as the English word "faith," extending from simple belief to a confident trust in or reliance on a person. The shades of meaning, too, almost certainly vary according as the words are used in conjunction with one preposition or another. It is possible here to give only an elementary study, in which passages between which fine shades of distinction may be made are grouped together.]

What Is Faith?

We have a suggestive description, if not definition, in Hebrews 11:1, "Faith is assurance of [or, giving substance to things hoped for, a conviction [or, test] of things not seen." Of things which are the objects of hope, as God's promises faith is or confidence. Of the wider class of things unseen, whether objects of hope or not, faith is conviction that they are or are not so-and-so. Rotherham translates the verse: "faith is of things hoped for a confidence, of facts a conviction when they are not seen." Abraham's belief in God's promises (Hebrews 11:3) may be cited as an illustration of the first clause; our belief as to the making of the world (v. 3) of the second. In the same chapter is an instance of faith and belief as the same thing. See Hebrews 11:6. This is obscured by the fact

that in English we have not a verb corresponding exactly to the noun "faith." If we could talk of "faithing" a thing, our language would be more nearly in the position of the Greek. Sometimes we hear of men who pray for "faith to believe"; which really is equivalent to asking for faith to have faith, or for belief to believe. It is at the present day often imagined that there is a difference in kind between faith or belief as it affects the grand concern of our salvation and faith in a truth of everyday life or in a friend. Now, it must be held that it is precisely the same mental process or state for me to believe in God as to have faith in any human friend, to believe the truths regarding Jesus Christ and his salvation as to believe a man when he tells me of some alleged fact. The truth is that the difference is not one as to the kind of faith, but it is a difference in object. Why it is immeasurably better to trust in Christ than to have faith in man is because of the person of Christ and the glorious work he can do. My faith is the same, but it is directed towards a Redeemer and Savior who is worthy of confidence, and who is a rewarder of trust far beyond any human being in whom I may believe. A friend makes a statement to me and advises a certain course. I believe his word and do as he suggests. Everybody is familiar with that simple belief. Now, a similar belief in Jesus' word and acquiescence in his will will save. It may well be said that the common use of the phrase "saving faith," is one of the misfortunes of Christendom, for it suggests to me that the efficacy is due to a difference in my faith subjectively considered, when the saving power of my faith depends wholly on the fact that its object is the Savior and that it leads me to accept and obey him as my Savior. Learn and teach this glorious truth: "The saving power of faith resides not in itself, but in the Almighty Savior on whom it rests." The faith which saves may be seen from two passages of Scripture.

(a) James, speaking of a certain man's faith, says it is "dead." What for James is a dead faith? Simply a faith that is not allowed to have its legitimate outlet in works (James 2:17). We have indicated in this verse the weakness in the faith of many to-day. There is little fault to be found with their faith as such; the trouble is that that faith is by itself and is therefore profitless. Most men in our land believe the words of Jesus, if they would only let that belief lead them to obey Christ and have its fitting result in works of service, theirs would be a "saving faith." Man is not saved by faith alone. True, man has no meritorious works, his salvation is an act of free grace, yet he must let faith issue in action, else it is dead, barren, profitless, according to God's Word.

(b) The Apostle Paul wrote: "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness" (Romans 10:10). This verse has given rise to the popular distinction between a "heart belief" and a "head belief." There should be no incompatibility between a head and a heart belief. Apparently what Paul means is that our belief should be one in which not only our intellect, but also our affections and will, are involved. Mere intellectual assent to gospel truths is not enough. The case of the rulers who believed on Jesus, but did not confess him, since they loved men's praise (John 12:42) may be cited as a good illustration of belief which is neither "with the heart" nor "unto righteousness."

02.13. FAITH - 02 - How is Faith Produced?

FAITH – 02 - How is Faith Produced?

We believe in the occurrences of every-day events which have not happened in our own presence on the testimony of others. Belief in Christ and the gospel facts comes in precisely the same way. Some have denied this; but they do so only on the mistaken notion that the denial of the sinner's power to exercise saving faith on the simple proclamation of the gospel honors God, and because they strain to breaking point certain statements as to man's helpless condition. We need not enter into argument. It is sufficient to quote the Bible's own statement as to the production of faith.

(a) John said he wrote his gospel to produce faith. "These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name" (John 20:31). If the gospel story is given to produce faith, surely it is idle to expect faith apart from such testimony as the gospel gives.

(b) Paul asked, "How shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" and in most explicit fashion continued, Isaiah saith, Who hath believed our report? So belief cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ" (Romans 10:14-17). A volume of argument could make the matter no clearer.

(c) Jesus said: "Preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:15-16). As in the former cases, the preaching has as its consequent belief. It is worse than sad, it is sinful, to say aught to men which will keep them from the appointed method of getting faith in Christ. Men who lack it should be referred to the divine testimony. When this is once fairly put before them it is in their power either to believe or disbelieve.

There is one passage which is often quoted in favor of the view that faith is in the direct gift of God to the human soul. Paul says: "By grace have ye been saved through faith and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God" (Ephesians 2:8). This text does not prove the theory. It is almost certain that the word "that" refers to the idea of salvation running through the passage. Yet we do know that faith has its origin in God (Ephesians 6:23; Php 1:29). Just as repentance is a man's own act, yet is said to be given by God (Acts 5:31), since he furnishes the motives, so faith is at once man's act and the gift of God who provides the testimony. What we have said already of the Spirit's work in conversion applies here. Man is commanded to believe (Mark 1:15; Acts 16:31). A gift is not commanded. If man is told to believe, it implies he can do it. God would not command belief but for this ability. He would not condemn men for the disbelief which did not lie within their power. We must not teach that faith is God's gift in such a sense as to make him responsible for the unbelief of men. Much mischief has been done to human souls by the doctrine that "saving faith" is some mysterious and direct gift; the sinner is often encouraged to wait and agonize, when as a matter of fact the testimony of the Word of God through which faith comes (Romans 10:17) is within his reach; or when, as often happens, it is not faith which is lacking but letting faith find its legitimate outcome in obedience to and service of God.

02.14. Faith - 03 - The Importance of Faith.

Faith – 03 – The Importance of Faith.

Faith is all-important. The first work of the Christian preacher should be to bring men to a heart-felt belief in God and in Christ, for without this other instruction cannot profit. This is easily seen from some Bible statements. 1. Faith in God is declared to be so essential that men cannot please God without it (Hebrews 11:6). That is fairly sweeping. There is sin in unbelief, just as fatal in its effects as sin is in action. Faith not issuing in holy life profits nothing. A moral life without faith in God is not enough. That God should furnish motives to faith, and that his creatures should yet not believe on him, not trust him, how could that be aught but deadly sin? 2. Faith in Jesus Christ, belief in the gospel, has been made an indispensable condition of salvation. Of him to whom the message fairly comes it is said: "He that disbelieveth shall be condemned" (Mark 16:16). "He that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God" (John 3:18). These verses are called harsh by some. These should remember that faith is just as essential in our ordinary life--family, social, business, political. Why should it not be vital in the spiritual sphere as well? "The law of nature is as imperious and universal as the law of the gospel." Each of us passes through a stage in which the law of our natural existence says, "If he believed not his mother or his nurse, he must die." Again, it has to be borne in mind that there is a moral cause of unbelief; it is not all intellectual. After John 3:18 we must read John 3:19-21. Also, we may see the bright side even of "he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." If a loving Savior who died for men said that, then all may believe if they will. Accountability presupposes ability. 3. The effects of faith proclaim its importance. The gospel is God's power unto salvation. Grace is free to all. Provision for this life and life eternal is abundant. But faith is the channel through which these blessings flow. We are saved through faith (Ephesians 2:8), justified by faith (Romans 3:28; Romans 5:1), live by faith (Romans 1:17; Galatians 2:20), are sanctified by faith (Acts 26:18). Faith overcomes the world (1 John 5:4), and purifies our hearts (Acts 15:9). Christ saves us, but obedient faith brings us into Christ. We are "sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:26). We are said to believe "into" or "unto" Christ. We believe Jesus, believe in Jesus, believe on Jesus, but perhaps the best thing the New Testament tells us about faith is that we believe into or unto him, or his name (see Matthew 18:6; John 17:20; Acts 10:43; Php 1:29; 1 John 5:13). In the lesson on Baptism we shall find that we are "baptized into Christ" (Galatians 3:27); here we learn that we believe into him. There is no discrepancy. It is obedient faith which counts. There is an "obedience of faith" (Romans 1:5; Romans 16:26), and wherever the blessing of God is attributed to faith, that faith is meant which issues in obedience, and not faith which stands alone or refrains from obedience. Thus Abraham was justified by faith (Romans 4:2-3; Romans 4:9); but it is equally true that he was justified by works, and not by faith alone (James 2:20-23), i.e., by works not as meritorious but the fruits of faith.

02.15. Faith - 04 - What Must We Believe to be Saved?

Faith – 04 – What Must We Believe to be Saved?

It may seem strange to leave so important a question to the last. But in our lesson on Confession it will be shown that there is a divine confession of faith, in which we must express our belief. We have already seen that we must believe in God (Hebrews 11:6); in or on Christ (Acts 16:31), in the gospel (Mark 16:15-16), which includes the great facts of the death, burial and resurrection of Christ (1 Corinthians 15:1-4). God is not the justifier of all, but of "him that hath faith in Jesus" (Romans 3:27). It was to bring men to faith in him that John wrote (John 20:31). The fundamental proposition is, as we shall see later, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God (Matthew 16:16-18). As we close this study, it should be with the desire and determination to be "full of faith" (Acts 6:5), to "fight the good fight of faith" (1 Timothy 6:12). To this end, it may be our appropriate prayer, "Lord, increase our faith" (Luke 17:5).

QUESTIONS.

1. What is faith? 2. How are men to obtain faith? 3. What possibility is there of salvation apart from faith? 4. Have men ability to believe? 5. In what sense may faith be called the gift of God? 6. Wherein lies the efficacy of our faith? 7. How would you show that faith alone will not save? 8. What do you mean by a "dead" faith? 9. How was Abraham justified? 10. Name three promises conditioned by faith. 11. Is faith always used in the same sense in the Bible? 12. What is the great central truth of the Christian system presented to us as an object of faith?

02.16. REPENTANCE - 01 - What is Repentance?

REPENTANCE – 01 – What is Repentance?

Reading. Luke 15:11-24; Romans 10:5-10.

Golden Text. And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent.--Acts 17:30.

Daily Readings. Ezekiel 18:20-32; Jonah 3:1-10; 2 Corinthians 7:8-11; Luke 13:1-5; Matthew 16:13-20;

1 Timothy 6:10-16; Acts 8:27-38.

REPENTANCE.

WE here, again, deal with a vital theme. It is truly a "first principle." There is no salvation without repentance. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13:5). It will be an easy matter for the interested reader to use a Concordance and refer to every New Testament passage dealing with repentance. He will then have all the data before him.

What is Repentance?

It is a little unfortunate that two different Greek words, *metamelomai* and *metanoeo*, are both translated by "repent." We have the former in Matthew 21:29; Matthew 21:32; Matthew 27:3 (re Judas); and Hebrews 7:21 (the Lord "will not repent"). The Common Version renders it "repent" also in 2 Corinthians 7:8-10, while the R.V. in this passage with much more clearness translates it "regret," leaving *metaoneo* to be represented by "repent," thus: "For though I made you sorry with my epistle, I do not regret it, though I did regret; for I see that that epistle made you sorry, though but for a season. Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye were made sorry unto repentance: for ye were made sorry after a godly sort, that ye might suffer loss by us in nothing. For godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation, a repentance which bringeth no regret: but the sorrow of the world worketh death." The word "repentance" is always the translation of *metanoia*. One exception is found in Romans 11:29, where we have an adjective *ametameleta* used of God's gifts which are unrepented of or unregretted; it is the same word which is translated in 2 Corinthians 7:10 by "which bringeth no regret." We have, then, only one word, *metanoeo*, used in connection with faith and the gospel facts, indicating change of mind issuing in, change of life, used in the imperative mood to sinners who would be saved. Judas's case fairly clearly indicates the meaning of the other word: he had regret or remorse, but his mind and will were unchanged, and did not lead him to turn again to serve Christ. The foregoing passages teach the important lesson that repentance is not merely sorrow. Judas sorrowed, but did not repent. Paul discriminated even between godly sorrow for sin and the repentance which was its result (2 Corinthians 7:1-16). Nor is repentance actually the turning to God, if Peter is to be freed from the charge of tautology; for he said, "Repent and turn" (Acts 3:19). Repentance is not to be confused with reformation of life. Godly living, changed habits and actions, are the fruits worthy of

repentance (Matthew 3:8), and not really the repentance itself. This latter distinction may perhaps be illustrated by a reference to Luke 17:3-4, one does not reform seven times a day. The meaning of the Greek verb is "to change one's mind or purpose." Professor McGarvey, with due regard to this meaning and New Testament usage, says: "Repentance, then, fully defined, is a change of will caused by sorrow for sin, and leading to a reformation of life." Since this is primarily a Bible study, the foregoing remarks have been deemed necessary. The writer, however, candidly expresses the opinion, that it is very easy to so dwell on the fixing of the exact moment when a person may truly be said to repent as to miss the more important matters. Few people are perplexed on the practical side of repentance. They may not repent, but they know what it means. We could criticize such a definition as the following, "Repentance is true sorrow for sin, with sincere effort to forsake it," or the more homely phrase, "being sorry enough to quit," but surely these have the essential idea. He who has turned to God and who manifests the fruits of the Spirit, has repented, whether he can give a precise definition or not. The Lord wants the actual thing itself; he did not say, "Except ye can write out a definition of repentance exact to the dot of an 'i' or the stroke of a 't,' ye shall all likewise perish." We of course in no wise belittle the advisability of precision in the use of Scriptural language. Only, teachers are urged not to lose sight of the purpose of Bible School work. Get scholars to practice repentance as well as to define it. Our reading from Luke 15:1-32 beautifully illustrates repentance. Read the story of the prodigal. Just after he "came to himself" (Luke 15:17), and when he determined to arise and go to the father (Luke 15:18), he repented. Let us strive to bring men to this point.

02.17. Repentance - 02 - What Produces Repentance?

Repentance – 02 – What Produces Repentance?

(a) The prime prerequisite to repentance is a sense of sin. If one repents of sin he must first have realised that he is a sinner. Many need to begin here. So long as sin is lightly treated, so long as it is thought of as the result of weakness merely, repentance cannot be expected.

(b) Now, since sin is committed against God (see our second lesson on "Sin and Its Cure"), belief in God is obviously a condition of repentance. It is "repentance towards God" (Acts 20:21) which is required.

(c) "The goodness of God," says Paul, "leadeth thee to repentance" (Romans 2:4). This implies belief in God and a recognition of our indebtedness to him for the blessings of life. Our homes, daily comforts, health, preservation from harm and evil, church fellowship, school privileges, the Bible revelation, gospel overtures--all these are evidence of God's goodness to us.

(d) "Godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation" (2 Corinthians 7:10). "Godly sorrow" is "sorrow according to God" (margin)--i. e., according to the will of God, of the fashion required by God--and is contrasted with "the sorrow of the world," which does not issue in turning from sin to serve God. Some believe this verse has explicit reference to the difference between "repentance and remorse, between sorrow for sin and sorrow for its consequences." Judas and Peter furnish examples of the two kinds of sorrow.

(e) The thought of judgment to come leads often to repentance. So with the men of Nineveh (Luke 11:32; cf. Jonah 3:4). See also Acts 17:30-31.

The foregoing Scriptures will serve to explain two others, in which it is stated that God gives or grants repentance (see Acts 5:31; Acts 11:18). God gives it by furnishing all the motives to repentance. His supreme agency in this is the gospel of Jesus Christ, in which God's love is revealed. The heart of the conscious sinner is melted by the story of redeeming love, and he is led to determine on a better life. Repentance is none the less man's own act. The command to repent implies this. Men are consistently spoken of and to as if they were able to repent, and were responsible to God and justly condemnable if they did not. God "commandeth men that they should all everywhere repent" (Acts 17:30). Jesus upbraided "the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not" (Matthew 11:20). This could not have been so, if these cities were passive, and only waiting till God directly gave repentance. See also Luke 13:3; Acts 2:38, etc.

02.18. Repentance - 03 - The Results of Repentance.

Repentance – 03 – The Results of Repentance.

These are mostly implied in the foregoing Sections.

(a) We first note what may be called the Godward side. It is "unto life" (Acts 11:18); "toward God" (Acts 20:1-38 :al); "unto salvation" (2 Corinthians 7:10); "unto the remission of our sins" (Acts 2:38); "that your sins may be blotted out, that SO there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, and that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus" (Acts 3:19-20).

(b) On man's part repentance is followed by his turning to God (Acts 3:19), and the doing of works meet for repentance (Acts 26:20; Matthew 3:8). The sinner "out of a true sense of his sin, and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, cloth, with grief and hatred of his sin, turn from it unto God, with full purpose of, and endeavor after, new obedience." This article is written in the belief that repentance implies the making of restitution where this is possible. This seems in harmony with the very meaning of the word, and with the Savior's approval of the conduct of Zacchaeus (Luke 19:8-9). Dare we say that Adam Clark's words are too strong: "No man should expect mercy at the hand of God, who, having wronged his neighbor, refuses, when he has it in his power, to make restitution. Were he to weep tears of blood, both the justice and mercy of God would shut out his prayers if he make not his neighbor amends for the injury he has done him"? At any rate, such words emphasise that repentance is not a maudlin sentiment.

02.19. CONFESSION - 01 - What is Confession?

CONFESSION – 01 – What is Confession?

This part of the lesson has to do not with confession of sins to God or man, but with the confession of faith which the Lord has asked for on the part of every one who would put on Christ in baptism and receive the privileges of church fellowship and membership. All religious bodies agree that some confession of faith should be made, unfortunately, many do not seem to realise that the Lord Jesus who established his church made full provision for its creed and confession.

What is It?

That there was some definite confession asked in apostolic days is proved by Paul's words to Timothy. Twice in one short passage the apostle refers to what had at that date assumed the definite name of "the good confession." The reference is made in such a way as to imply that the phrase had a well-known connotation. Paul says: "Lay hold of the life eternal, whereunto thou wast called, and didst confess the good confession in the sight of many witnesses. I charge thee, in the sight of God, who giveth life to all things, and of Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession," etc. (1 Timothy 6:12-13). Notice the definite article, and the precise reference implied in its use; the Common Version has seemingly done its best to obscure this point by rendering weakly and variously, "a good profession" and "a good confession." This passage shows that the apostle has not in mind merely the acknowledgment of Christ in a faithful Christian life, nor the daily witness in word appropriate thereto (for it was "the good confession" made unto eternal life). More, Paul says Jesus witnessed "the good confession" before Pilate. We are told in the Gospels of two confessions which Jesus made at his trial--one before the high priest who asked him, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" when he replied, "I am" (Mark 14:61-62), and one before Pilate who enquired, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" to which Jesus answered, "Thou sayest" (Mark 15:2). In each of these confessions we have Jesus' witness to his Messiahship. We have to remember that the whole trial of Jesus, the accusation of him before Pilate, was due to the claim that he made to be the Christ, the Son of God. The question had often come up (see esp., John 7:26; John 9:22; John 12:42). In Matthew 16:16-18 we read that Jesus had carefully elicited from Peter the confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son, of the living God," Jesus declared Peter blessed for making it, and further said that the truth so confessed was the rock-foundation on which the church would be built. Paul in Romans 10:9 says, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved"; and in Romans 10:10 he adds, "with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." These texts show what has to be confessed ("Jesus as Lord," cf. 1 Corinthians 12:3), and that it is not merely the confession of a holy character, but a definite confession in words ("with the mouth" is twice stated). We have then a required confession of faith not in a system of theology, not in humanly devised creeds or articles, not in a compendium of Scripture truth even, but in a Divine Person. Jesus asked folk to confess him (Luke 12:8). In complete accord with these Scriptures, we have the early preachers' proclamations of the Christ. Peter

preached the first gospel sermon for the purpose of leading to a belief in Jesus: "Let all the house of Israel, therefore, know assuredly that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified" (Acts 2:36). Philip preached Jesus (Acts 8:35). Acts 8:37 is probably an interpolation (see R.V. and margin); so we do not use it here. It is quite in harmony with other passages, though, and it is known to have been in existence as early as the time of in the second century Those who believe in its being an interpolation yet allow its accord with New Testament practice and, as Plumptre says with "the received type of the prevailing order for baptism." Paul preached Christ and him crucified (see 1 Corinthians 1:23; 1 Corinthians 2:3). We learn, then, regarding this good confession that God the Father made it (see Matthew 3:17; Matthew 17:5), Christ made it, Peter made it, Timothy made it, and Jesus would have all to make it. It is the only confession which we are authorised to demand. It is all-sufficient, wide enough to include all who wish simply to believe in and obey the Lord Christ, narrow enough to exclude unbelievers. It is enough, for he who believes in Jesus with the heart will believe all the words of Jesus, and the words of his accredited apostles, and will do what the Lord asks of him. Loyalty to Jesus is the supreme test of the Christian. Our "good confession" exalts him and puts him at the very centre of our religion. We have no right whatever to put our views regarding anything in the heavens above, in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth, in the place of the simple confession of faith in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God.

02.20. CONFESSION - 02 - What Promises Are Attached to It?

CONFESSION – 02 – What Promises Are Attached to It?

"The good confession" is unto life eternal, Paul says (1 Timothy 6:12). It is "unto salvation" (Romans 10:9-10). The Apostle John says, "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him, and he in God" (1 John 4:15). We have the word of our Savior, "Every one who shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God" (Luke 12:8; cf. Matthew 10:32). The importance and blessedness of this confession stand revealed. Pages of comment could not add to the clearness of these words.

02.21. CONFESSION - 03 - Reasons for the Good Confession.

CONFESSION – 03 – Reasons for the Good Confession.

1. God asks it. That is reason enough for our making it. But we may venture to see how natural such a confession is. 2. It is due to Christ. If we believe Jesus is what he claimed, we should be glad to confess him and show our trust and love. 3. It is due to the church. It helps the church to hear others confess him who is the church's Head. Christians love to hear the good confession, and are encouraged by it in their own Christian life. 4. It is due to the world. If Christ has done anything for you, he can do it also for others. Confession proclaims this. The confessor says in effect:--

"Now will I tell to all around What a dear Savior I have found; I'll point to his redeeming blood, And say, 'Behold, the way to God.'"

5. It helps the man himself. There can be no permanent and secret discipleship. He who tries this must fail. Be openly decided, be committed publicly to Christ in confession of his name before witnesses, and this very fact will prove a strength in time of temptation. Professor James was perhaps the world's greatest psychologist, as such he wrote: "In the acquisition of a new habit, or the leaving off of an old one, we must take care to launch ourselves with as strong and decided an initiative as possible. Accumulate all the possible circumstances which shall reinforce the right motives; put yourself assiduously in conditions that encourage the new way; make engagements incompatible with the old; take a public pledge, if the case allows, in short, envelope your resolution with every aid you know." Is not all this beautifully applicable to "the good confession" as leading to baptism and church membership? It seems as if we must make the confession some day; if not now, then in the great day when we all stand before the judgment seat of Christ (see Romans 14:11-12; Php 2:9-11). It would be wise to do it now; then there is no blessed promise attached to it. Then Jesus will be ashamed of him who was ashamed to confess him here (Mark 8:38). May we hasten to own his sway, confess his name, and then "let us hold fast our confession" (Hebrews 4:14; Hebrews 10:23).

QUESTIONS.

1. Give in your own words a definition of repentance and show that it is in harmony with Scripture. 2. Show the importance of repentance. 3. What is meant by "sorrow according to God"? 4. What is the difference between the sorrow which works repentance and sorrow unto death? 5. God gives repentance: how? 6. What are fruits meet for repentance? 7. Who made "the good confession"? 8. What must we confess? 9. Is it enough to confess Christ in a life of holiness? 10. What promises are attached to confession of Christ? 11. What great use can you see in public confession? 12. Do you think the eunuch confessed Christ? (See Acts 8:34-38, A.V. and R.V.).

02.22. BAPTISM - 01 - The Action of Baptism

BAPTISM - 01 – The Action of Baptism Reading. Romans 6:1-18.

Golden Text He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.--Mark 16:16.

Daily Readings. Matthew 3:13-17; Matthew 28:16-20; Acts 8:26-40; Acts 9:10-22; Romans 6:1-18; Acts 2:37-47; Acts 22:3-16.

AMONGST the very last directions of the risen Savior was the injunction to his disciples to make disciples of an the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit (Matthew 28:19-20). This ordinance, intended by Jesus to be the universal accompaniment of discipleship, is in itself wondrously beautiful, fun of significance, honored by the Masters own example, and introductory to the blessings he was graciously pleased to promise to the qualified recipient of it. While it is lamentably true that that which should have been a bond of union and a sign of common Christianity has often been made an occasion of strife we shall on examination of the Scriptures find that the Lord has so plainly revealed his will that we need not be troubled by the divergent beliefs of men. He who is interested enough in the subject of baptism to read what the New Testament has to say about it, with the determination in his heart to do whatever Christ would have him do, is not likely to go far astray. The Action of Baptism.

We have first to find out what act was performed. Some tell us that a man may be baptized either by sprinkling, pouring or immersion. Does it appear so from the New Testaments? We may notice that were we to come across--as indeed we often do--the Greek word transliterated "baptize" in, the classical writings of Greece, we should never translate it by "sprinkle" or "pour." The word means "dip" or "submerge," or "immerse." That immersion is baptism has never been denied by any one; no debate ever was held in which this was denied. Ministers of churches which practice sprinkling will on occasion immerse. The Anglican Church has more than sanctioned immersion, for its Prayer Book explicitly states that the priest shall take the child (if it may well endure It) and "dip it in the water, discreetly and warily." But it is held by many that sprinkling or pouring will, equally with immersion, fulfill the requirements of the New Testament. We shall see.

(a) We have the record of the baptism of Jesus our great Exemplar. We are told that John, who was honored as the baptizer of our Lord, baptized the people "in the river Jordan" (Mark 1:5). Jesus, we are also told, "was baptized of John in the Jordan" (Mark 1:9). The preposition in Mark 1:9 is not the same as in Mark 1:5. Mark 1:9 says really that the baptism was "into the Jordan" (see margin, R. V.). It would make nonsense to use this preposition in the circumstances if sprinkling or pouring was the act, as may be seen by substituting either of these words for "baptize" or re-immersion" in this verse. We are also informed that Jesus came "up out of the water" (Mark 1:10); so he had been down into it.

(b) This agrees with the baptism of the eunuch, as recorded in Acts 8:38-39, where there was a going "down into the water" and a coming "up out of the water." Some have in this latter case

especially asserted that "into" may only denote close proximity to, but Luke said before they came "unto" the water, and now says that as a subsequent act they went "down into" it. When some try to break the force of this by saying that even if they were in the water, still sprinkling could be the act performed, we reply, first, that the very reason which now generally keeps those who practice sprinkling or pouring from going down into the water (since in their case there is no need to take such a cumbrous method) would have kept John and Philip from doing so had they practiced pouring or sprinkling; while the very reason which makes a candidate for immersion go "down into" the water would sufficiently explain the statements in Mark 1:10 and Acts 8:38.

(c) John baptized in Aenon, near to Salim, "because there was much water there" (John 3:23). That "because" does not suit sprinkling.

(d) When we seek to settle what was performed "in the river Jordan" by John the Baptist, or by Philip when he and the eunuch "went down into the water," there are illuminative passages in Romans 6:3-4, and Colossians 2:12. There we are told that Christians were "buried" with Christ in or through baptism. On sprinkling or pouring there is no enveloping, no covering up, no hiding from view, such as is implied in the word "buried"; in immersion there is. We would be quite content that any honest seeker for the will of God should learn that in baptism he should go down into the water, be there "buried in baptism" then rise or come "up out of the water" and should then do what in his heart he believes the Savior and the early disciples did. That we are not peculiar in thus using Romans 6:3; Romans 4:1-25, we may show. John Wesley in his "Notes on the New Testament," says: "We are buried with him--alluding to the ancient manner of baptising by immersion." Coneybeare and Howson in, "The Life and Epistles of St. Paul say emphatically, "This passage cannot be understood unless it be born in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion." Hastings' Bible Dictionary says "Immersion is implied in Romans 6:4 and Colossians 2:12."

In addition to New Testament examples of baptism, we have two metaphorical uses of the word "baptize" which are important in this connection.

(a) We read of Christ's baptism of suffering (Mark 10:38; Luke 12:50). Now, everybody agrees that Jesus' suffering was great, intense, that he was overwhelmed by it, and that therefore it is called a baptism. To liken that suffering to a sprinkling would be abhorrent to every believer. So the Oxford "Helps to the Study of the Bible" says: "The original mode of baptism was immersion. Hence the metaphorical use of the word of an overwhelming sorrow."

(b) The baptism in the Holy Spirit is only explicable on the view that the Spirit so took possession of those who were recipients of it that they might fitly be said to be enveloped in or overwhelmed by it.

We need not discuss in detail why a change was ever made from Immersion to sprinkling or pouring. Various reasons are given, none of which can weigh with the man who has the supreme desire of finding out what the Lord appointed and of doing exactly what he said. Slice to say that effusion was practiced in cases of dangerous illness. There was a fear as to the fate of the unbaptized person, coupled with an overrating of baptism per se. It is significant that the Greek Church has never practiced sprinkling. Dean Stanley says "For the first thirteen centuries the almost universal practice of baptism was that of which we read in the New Testament, and that

which is the very meaning of the word 'baptize'--that those who were baptized were plunged, submerged immersed into the water." We may, ere passing on, mention that we have not ventured to discuss the mode of baptism. Immersion is not a mode of baptism; it is baptism. We do not know how the Immersion was carried out in New Testament days, but we know that immersion was practiced, nor do we speak of baptism by immersion (though one or two of our quotations from others contain that objectionable idea). "Baptism by immersion" means baptism by baptism or immersion by immersion.

02.23. BAPTISM - 02 - Subjects of Baptism.

BAPTISM – 02 – Subjects of Baptism.

The question is, Who may scripturally be baptized? Nobody in the world, be he wisest theologian or profoundest Christian philosopher, knows one particle more about this question than what the Scriptures reveal. None have private revelations on the subject, and no one can presume to pit an opinion of his own as to the proper subjects against the teaching of the Bible. The professing Christian world is generally agreed that those who believe in Jesus Christ and who are truly penitent, are fit subjects of baptism. Many claim that in addition thereto infants may also scripturally be baptized. Our practice of baptising penitent believers is admitted by all to be right. The practice of what is called "infant baptism" has been variously justified. Indeed, considerable difference has existed among paedo-baptists as to what infants may be baptized; some said children of members of the church; others declared children of whom one parent was a communicant; others would have admitted children of believers who were not communicants; some declared, "Charity bids us hope well of all." There are three ways in which we can learn the will of God on this question: (1) We may have commands regarding baptism; (2) We may find examples of baptism; (3) We may have necessary inferences from Scripture records. Let us apply these methods in our study. 1. Have we a command to baptize? Yes, nearly all professed Christians believe baptism to be a command of permanent obligation. But whom does the command concern? Those to whose ears it comes, so that they can intelligently obey it.

(a) Have we a command for the baptism of penitent believers? Yes. The apostles were charged to baptize those whom they discipled (Matthew 28:19-20). The gospel was to be preached, and "he that believeth and is baptized" was promised pardon (Mark 16:15-16). People who were pricked to the heart, believing they had crucified their Messiah, were commanded to "repent and be baptized" (Acts 2:38). Gentiles on whom the Spirit had come, people speaking with tongues and magnifying God (and therefore not unconscious infants) were commanded to be baptized (Acts 10:44-48). Saul, a penitent bet/ever of three days' standing, was commanded, by a special messenger from God, "Arise, and be baptized" (Acts 22:16).

(b) Have we a command that infants should be baptized? We can quote no texts. There is no such command anywhere in God's Word.

2. Have we examples of baptism in God's Word? Yes, many of them.

(a) We have the following instances of the baptism of believers: Three thousand who "gladly received the word" spoken by God's apostle were baptized (Acts 2:41); the Samaritans, "when they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ" "were baptized, both men and women" (Acts 8:12); the eunuch, instructed in the things of the Lord, was baptized (Acts 8:35-38); "Many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized" (Acts 18:8).

(b) We have no recorded instance in Scripture of the baptism of an infant. Infants are mentioned in some passages; baptism is mentioned in other passages: the infants and the baptism are not found together.

3. In the absence of command or example, advocates of infant baptism have recourse to inference. True, some (as Plummer in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible) confess, "Not only is there no mention of the baptism of infants, but there is no text from which such baptism can be securely inferred."

(a) Some say that because children were admitted to the old covenant, therefore they should be admitted into the new. The inference is not valid, for this, if for no other reason. The Old Covenant has passed away (Hebrews 8:7-13); with a change of priesthood, there is a change of law (Hebrews 7:12),

(b) What is a special form of this argument is the statement that baptism came in the place of circumcision, and therefore infants should be baptized. There is not a shadow of proof anywhere that baptism came in the place of circumcision. The latter was practiced for long concurrently with the former. Circumcision was a fleshly ordinance, not requiring faith or any moral qualification in the recipient. Circumcision was based on conditions of flesh and property (see Genesis 18:12-13); Pedo-baptists uniformly decline to claim parallelism here. It was not an initiatory rite, as baptism is. The descendants of Abraham entered the covenant by birth of flesh and blood; baptism is initiatory to the body of Christ (1 Corinthians 12:13). We cannot go back to Genesis and search the law of circumcision for information as to another rite which was not instituted till nineteen centuries later, and then in words which never hinted that there was any connection between the two ordinances.

(c) Acts 2:39, "To you is the promise, and to your children" is oft quoted. "You" here represents the Jews present; "your children" were their posterity; both are distinguished from "all that are afar off," i. e., Gentiles. That the "children" here were not unconscious infants is proved by two considerations:

(i.) The promise was for "even as many as the Lord our God shall call." We wish all would wait for the children to hear and respond to God's call.

(ii.) "The promise" which was to their "children" was the promise of the Holy Spirit's being given on condition of repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus (Acts 2:38) orally, the promise is for everybody who can fulfill its conditions.

(d) Household baptisms are often appealed to. These we may be sure were not out of harmony with the terms of the commission (Matthew 28:19-20; Mark 16:15-16) But we know the jailor and his house believed (Acts 16:32-34), Crispus and his house believed (Acts 18:8), the household of Stephanas addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints (1 Corinthians 16:15). In these cases we know no infants were baptized. Regarding Gaius and Lydia, we have the alternative of interpreting their cases in accord with the uniform teaching and example of the New Testament; or of assuming that these folk were married, had children, and children too young to believe, who must then as in the household be held to be baptized. Assumption is not a strong enough foundation for a church ordinance.

Infant baptism really came in through a strained view that "original sin" somehow imperiled the infant's soul, and through an exaggerated and quite unscriptural belief in the efficacy of baptism to save. Of course it is not the case that all Paedobaptists now take this view, though Roman Catholics and some others still do so.

02.24. BAPTISM - 03 - The Significance of Baptism.

BAPTISM – 03 – The Significance of Baptism.

The Lord appointed the ordinance of baptism; therefore it is wise and good. He has been pleased to reveal to us something at least of its design; he has attached some promises to it, and has shown us some of its consequences. It must continually be borne in mind that the promises and blessings are not attached to baptism alone; faith and repentance are ever prerequisites. Nor is there any magical efficacy in the waters of baptism, or any merit in the believer's action in being baptized. The Lord has been gracious enough to promise certain blessings to the obedient believer. It is our privilege to thankfully accept these, and to pass along the promises to others by faithful proclamation of the Savior's word. It is not ours either to promise blessings where he has not promised them, or to judge men who, ignorant of the New Testament teaching, yet live up to the light they have. We are now engaged in finding out what God has said. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). The baptism in the name of Jesus Christ of a penitent believer is "unto the remission of sin"; the gift of the Holy Spirit is promised to such an obedient one (Acts 2:38). Men are said to be baptized "into Christ," in whom all God's promises are, "in whom we have our redemption." This baptism into Christ is not opposed to our belief into Christ (see lesson on Faith). Paul recognised that the doctrine of baptism into Christ was compatible with and indeed explanatory of our sonship through faith: "Ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ" (Galatians 3:26-27). We are baptized into Christ's death (Romans 6:3); when we remember that his death procured our redemption, the significance of baptism if we are "baptized into his death" is obvious. We are baptized into Christ's church or body (1 Corinthians 12:13; cf. Colossians 1:18). We are baptized "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Matthew 28:19), or "into the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 19:5). To come into the name means at least to come into a new relationship with him whose name it is. The following words of Bishop B. F. Westcott, one of the greatest men engaged on the revision of our English New Testament are noteworthy here: "Am I wrong in saying that he who has mastered the meaning of the two prepositions into the name (for in the name in the baptismal formula, Matthew 28:19) and in Christ has found the central truth of Christianity? Certainly I would have gladly given the ten years of my life spent in the Revision to bring only these two phrases of the New Testament to the heart of Englishmen." Notice, in closing this study, one great text which covers action, subject, and design of baptism, and at the same time suggests a possible reason why the Lord chose immersion rather than sprinkling or pouring as the initiatory rite. The Apostle Paul wrote: "We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein? Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life" (Romans 6:2-4) Paul here in beautiful fashion shows the connection between God's appointed ordinance of baptism and the great facts of the gospel. He had said (1 Corinthians 15:1-4) that these great gospel facts were the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Here

he shows that God has ordained that the sinner seeking salvation must in baptism proclaim these facts, his experience must be one of death, burial and resurrection. See what the passage teaches:

(a) Of the action of baptism. It is a burial; the baptismal waters constitute a grave. There is a covering over. This is in favour of immersion, and against sprinkling or pouring.

(b) Of the subjects of baptism. It was the dead Christ who was buried. It is only one who has "died to sin" who can be scripturally buried. First dead, then buried--that is the proper order. It is a terrible thing in the natural world to have one buried who is not really dead. It is a worse thing when one is buried in baptism who has not died to sin. Faith and repentance are both implied here. Note that this is at once out of harmony with infant baptism and with the baptism of an unbelieving or impenitent man. The man of eighty years is not by reason of age more qualified than the babe of eight days. We plead not for adult, but for believer's baptism. Only he who has died to sin is ready to be buried with Christ.

(c) As to the significance of baptism. It is "into Christ" and "into his death"; therefore of great importance. But more, after burial comes resurrection. A dead Christ alone--a buried Christ alone--could not have saved. He was raised for our justification (Romans 4:25) But for his resurrection our faith justification were vain (1 Corinthians 15:14) As truly, will burial in baptism be quite fruitless unless it is followed by a rising to walk in newness of life. This rising to a new life is essential to Scriptural baptism, for Paul says: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him" (Colossians 2:12; cf. Colossians 3:1). We learn the efficacy of baptism: We "died with Christ" (Col. 2:30; Romans 6:8), are "buried with him" and are "raised with him." "With Christ" and "into Christ"--these are great phrases to consider in connection with the import of baptism.

It ought to be clear that the appointment of immersion was not an arbitrary thing. Coneybeare and Howson, the well known Church of England writers already quoted, say: "Baptism was (unless in exceptional cases) administered by immersion the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must, be a matter of regret that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism (though perhaps necessary in our northern climates) has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very important passages in Scripture." We altogether disagree with the parenthetical words in the above, but the writers' words are otherwise noteworthy. Would it not be well for all just to do what God would have them do, and even if they could not see, yet trust the Divine wisdom? He wishes all to become "obedient from the heart to that form of teaching" delivered by him (Romans 14:17).

"Thy will is good and just;

Shall I thy will withstand?

If Jesus bid me lick the dust,

I bow at his command."

QUESTIONS.

1. What does the story of Jesus' baptism teach as to the action of baptism? 2. Give two passages showing what act was performed in. 3. Name any commands you can find for (a) immersion, (b) sprinkling. 4. What does Christ's baptism of suffering teach as to the action of baptism? 5. Who may scripturally be baptized? 6. Mention three texts implying that believers only may be baptized. 7. Were there any infants among the three thousand baptized after Peter's sermon recorded in Acts 2:1-47? 8. Some quote the household baptisms in the New Testament to prove sprinkling. Examine the validity of this. 9. What promises are attached to baptism? 10. Are there promises attached to baptism alone? If not what is presupposed? 11. How does a man get "into Christ"? 12. Show the value of the teaching of Romans 6:3-4, as to the action, subjects and import of baptism.

02.25. THE CHURCH - 01 - Its Establishment

THE CHURCH – 01 – Its Establishment Reading. Matthew 16:13-20.

Golden Text. Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.--Matthew 16:18.

Daily Readings. Micah 4:1-2; Luke 24:44-49; Acts 2:1-4; Acts 2:33-47; Isaiah 28:16; 1 Corinthians 3:10-11;

1 Peter 2:6-7; Matthew 16:13-20; Hebrews 8:6-13; Ephesians 1:17-23; Ephesians 5:23-32

WHEN we begin to speak of "the church," it is desirable that we state clearly what we mean. What church is it whose establishment and membership, whose worship and ministry, we study. No human institution is worthy of such a prolonged notice in our Bible Schools. "The church" is not a human institution. We speak of the church of Jesus Christ (for he spoke of it as "my church," Matthew 16:18); "the church of God" (Acts 20:28; Galatians 1:13; 1 Timothy 3:5; 1 Timothy 3:15); the church which Christ loved and for which he gave himself (Ephesians 5:25), the church which is his body, of which he is the head (Colossians 1:18; Ephesians 5:23). These passages imply, as our very title "the church" does, that there is only one church. So Paul could say, "There is ... one body" (Ephesians 4:4). While we may scripturally speak of the church as a collective whole, including in it all God's redeemed ones on earth, yet it is clear that the New Testament speaks of local congregations of Christians as "churches." "The churches had rest" (Acts 9:31); we read of "the churches of the Gentiles" (Romans 16:4), "the churches of Judaea which were in Christ" (Galatians 1:22), "the church of God which is at Corinth" (1 Corinthians 1:2), "the church of the Thessalonians" (1 Thessalonians 1:1), "the churches" of Galatia (Galatians 1:2), Macedonia (2 Corinthians 8:1), Asia (1 Corinthians 16:19). This division of churches is a territorial one; all were churches of God, or churches of Christ. Our word "church" is a translation of the Greek word *ecclesia*, which was a word well known to all Greek-speaking people. In Athens the citizens all met in a public assembly, or *ecclesia*, to discuss and decide matters concerning the State. In the Greek version of the Old Testament Scriptures (a version current in apostolic days) the word is used of the children of Israel as assembled (Deuteronomy 31:30; Judges 21:8; 1 Chronicles 29:1, etc.). It is used in this sense in the New Testament (Acts 7:38; Hebrews 2:12). The word is also applied to the excited gathering of Ephesian citizens who were in a rage with the preachers of the gospel of Christ (Acts 19:39; Acts 19:41). We see then that to belong to an *ecclesia* is not in itself of much importance. That we should belong to the *ecclesia* the called-out people, of God or of Christ--that is a matter of transcendent importance, a token of highest privilege.

Establishment of the Church.

The church was established by Jesus Christ who bought it with his blood, who gave himself for it, whose name it wears. Our Lord said, "On this rock I will build my church" (Matthew 16:18). This passage is an exceedingly significant one. It tells us of the church's author and its foundation, and it helps to fix the date of its establishment. The rock, as we have seen was the great basal truth of

his Messiahship and Divine Sonship. The words, "I will build," tell us:--(a) of the Founder of the church. Christ built it, using in this the instrumentality of his apostles; (b) that the church was not yet built when Jesus used these words. He could never say, "I will build," if the church were already in existence. Some speak of the church as existing in the time of Abraham. Jesus' church was built after the words of Matthew 16:18 were spoken. The church was established at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, about ten days after Christ's ascension into heaven. We have the record in Acts 2:1-47. Before this, we have no mention of the church as in existence. After this we have repeated mention. The first time the word is employed of the Christian community as an existing thing is in Acts 5:11 (cf. Acts 2:47 A.V. and R.V.). There it is referred to as previously established thereafter we have repeated mention in Acts and the Epistles. Pentecost was afterwards known as "the beginning" time (see Acts 11:15). In this establishment, we may notice that we have the divinely appointed place. It had been foretold, seven centuries before: "In the latter days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and peoples shall flow into it. And many nations shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths, for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Micah 4:1-2; cf. Isaiah 2:2-4). Jesus had definitely said that the gospel should be first proclaimed in Jerusalem (Luke 24:47). It was fitting that he should first be declared King and risen Christ in the place where he had been condemned for his Messianic claim. It was fitting, too, that the church, the instrument of the propagation of that gospel, should be established there. We have the divinely appointed time--the "latter days" spoken of by Isaiah. The Jews held that Pentecost commemorated the giving of the law at Sinai. The new law certainly went forth on this day. It was, above all, the appointed time, in that Jesus had told his disciples to wait till they were endued with power from on high (Luke 24:49). The fulfilment of Jesus' promise of power came on Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4); so we get divinely appointed and qualified men as the Lord's instruments in the establishment of the church. These were the apostles. Jesus had said of them, "Ye shall be my witnesses" (Acts 1:8); "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me" (Matthew 10:40). The Savior's promise to his apostles of the Holy Spirit who should teach them all things and bring all things to their remembrance (John 14:26) was fulfilled on Pentecost. The apostles were filled with the Spirit (Acts 2:4). Peter, speaking by inspiration of that Spirit, was privileged to deliver the first gospel sermon, and three thousand were added. We have dwelt on these appointments of the Lord simply to show that we may implicitly accept and follow what was done by these men so splendidly qualified. When we seek the church and its benefits, we wish to be beyond danger of error. We may rely on the teaching and practice of the apostles in the matter of church membership, its conditions and privileges. Men might err, but the guiding Holy Spirit will lead aright, and these men spoke as the Spirit instructed them. After seeking to answer the questions, Founded by whom? where? when? we may ask, Why did the Lord Jesus establish a church? That he did so is a proof of the necessity of the church for our spiritual welfare. He knew that his children would be helped by common worship, by meeting together to present their united petitions to God, by exhorting and encouraging one another. There was much to be gained by having a community of such, each bound to help the other. The church was also established for the good of the world. Union always means strength, a church of a hundred members can do more than one hundred separate Christians will do. The unity of purpose and of effort in the church is one of the best ways to

impress the world. Its worship proclaims the Lord's death till he come (1 Corinthians 11:26). The church, the apostle tells us in a magnificent passage, stands as an object lesson to the celestial beings: "To the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God" (Ephesians 3:10) The church, briefly, exists for the glory of God, the good of its members, the benefit of the world. We cannot neglect it, or withhold ourselves from its membership and worship, and at the same time please God or ourselves get the good he intends us to receive.

02.26. THE CHURCH - 02 - Its Membership.

THE CHURCH – 02 – Its Membership.

If, as we believe, all who accept the salvation provided by Jesus Christ, all obedient believers are members of his church we have already answered the question of membership in our lessons on "Faith," "Repentance and Confession" and "Baptism." We need not repeat what we said there, but there lessons may be referred to. Since in Acts 2:1-47 we have the record of the church's establishment, we would naturally expect the conditions of membership to be given there. Acts 2:47 gives us, a suggestive word regarding church additions: "The Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved." We learn several things here: The Lord, not man, adds folk to his church. None are in it save the Lord's additions. One may plant, another may water, but God alone gives the increase (1 Corinthians 3:6). Since it is the Lord's church of which we wish to be members, and since he has not revealed to us that he has changed the conditions of entrance, it will be profitable to see whom he added of old. He added "those that were being saved." Who were these? A reading of Acts 2:37-41 will tell us something Three thousand who believed, who gladly heard the apostles; word, repented, and were baptized, were "added." These were the Lords additions. These accepted the conditions which we uniformly find in the New Testament. We may look at the matter from a different view-point. The church is the body of Christ (Colossians 1:18). The Corinthians were members of that body (1 Corinthians 12:27) Acts 18:8 tells us that "many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." The Epistle to the Corinthians witnesses to the same effect. The Corinthians received and believed the great facts of the gospel (1 Corinthians 15:1-4); they were "baptized into one body" (1 Corinthians 12:13). There is perfect harmony here with the conditions of membership given in Acts 2:1-47. There is a similar agreement in the experience of the members of "the churches of Galatia" (Galatians 1:2): they were "justified by faith"; were "sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus," having been "baptized into Christ" (Galatians 3:24-27). The letters to the Colossians and the Romans are in accord (Romans 6:3; Romans 4:1-25; Colossians 2:12). We could arrive at a similar result in another way. If the church is the body of which Christ is the Head, we would expect that men become attached to the body and to the Head in the same way. We find that it is so. Paul speaks of "the churches of Judaea which were in Christ" (Galatians 1:22), just as he repeatedly addresses Christians as "in Christ." We have seen already that the Scriptures speak of men believing into Christ, and being baptized into Christ. The Galatian letter itself is decisive (Galatians 3:26-27). If we agree that in denotation the kingdom of God, in so far as it is manifested in visible form on earth, corresponds to the church--and we have at least a definite apostolic statement that Christians have been delivered out of the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of the Son of his love (Colossians 1:13)--we have another simple line of proof. The Savior gave us the terms of entrance into the kingdom. "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God" (John 3:5). In this new birth we have implied the belief (cf. 1 John 5:1), repentance and baptism, which are given as terms of admission to the church. Some to-day deny that "born of water" refers to baptism, I believe the denial has been made through stress of controversy. A.

Plummer, in the article on "Baptism" in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, says that "until Calvin's day" it "had universally been interpreted as referring to baptism. Wesley's "Notes" so refer to it. The Church of England "Book of Common Prayer" has this interpretation in its "Order of Baptism." The writer's copy of the Westminster "Confession of Faith" has John 3:5 quoted as a proof text in the chapter "Of Baptism." The correspondence of John 3:3; John 3:5 with Titus 3:5; and indeed with Romans 6:3-4, will be noted by the careful reader. This is sufficient treatment of the question, How do we become members of the church? It is not disputed that the penitent baptized believer is eligible for admission to the church. But another, and most important question lies before us, What of continuance in the church of God? It must constantly be remembered that initiation into the church is not enough. It is good to come into Christ. It is better to continue to abide in Christ. We have Jesus' own exhortation to this (John 15:4; John 15:6-7). The Apostle John repeated the injunction (1 John 2:27-28). How shall we do this? The answer is that just as we came into Christ by initial obedience to his commands, so we continue to abide in him by continuing to keep his commandments (John 15:10). Christians are saved persons (Ephesians 2:8); yet from another viewpoint our salvation is nearer to us than when we first believed (Romans 13:11). We are not yet eternally saved; "He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved" (Matthew 10:22). Christians have been "translated into the kingdom of the Son of his love" (Colossians 1:13), but yet "the entrance into the eternal kingdom" lies before us; and to get this entrance we must in faith supply virtue, and in virtue knowledge, and in knowledge self-control, and in self-control patience, and in patience, godliness, and in godliness love of the brethren, and in love of the brethren love (2 Peter 1:5-11). As members of the church, we have been called out (for so the word ecclesia signifies), but we have now to give diligence to make our calling and election sure (2 Peter 1:10). The names by which members of the church are known in the New Testament are significant of the Lord's requirements. If they are "Christians" (1 Peter 4:6), they must glorify God in the name, it must from their lives be manifest that they are Christ's ones (cf. Acts 4:13). If they are "disciples" (Acts 9:1), they must continue to be true to their name and be learners of Christ who is meek and lowly in heart (Matthew 11:29), and must grow in knowledge (1 Peter 3:18). If they are "brethren" (Acts 9:30) they must "love the brotherhood" (1 Peter 2:17), they must not set their brethren at nought (Romans 14:10), or do wrong to and defraud their brethren (1 Corinthians 6:8). They who are "obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:7) must continue faithful: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life" (Revelation 2:10). It is not enough that a man be "born anew" (John 3:5), he must "walk in newness of life" (Romans 6:4). It is not enough that one "put on Christ" in baptism (Galatians 3:27); he must as a Christian put on Christ, wearing him daily, as it were, as he would wear a beautiful garment, which others may behold and admire (Romans 13:14). All Christians are called "saints" (Romans 1:7); but the name should not merely be a technical one: all should be "holy and without blemish and unreprouvable" (Colossians 1:22), holy in all manner of living as he which called them is holy (1 Peter 1:15-16). Let it not be thought that holiness of life is merely advisable, without being necessary. Jesus taught that fruit-bearing was a condition and test of discipleship (Matthew 7:16-20; John 15:8). Men of disorderly life are withdrawn from (2 Thessalonians 3:6 :1 Timothy 6:5). The church of God, both for its own good and in order that the sinner may be brought to repentance must have no company with men of wicked life (1 Corinthians 1:1-31), or with false teachers, so as to condone their errors (2 John 1:10-11). To have Christ, men must abide in the teaching (2 John 1:9). This continuance in good works this abiding in Christ, is obviously as important as the first acceptance of Christ. We can never too constantly

affirm the need of holy living (Titus 3:8). We must make it clear that he who becomes a Christian is a babe in Christ (1 Corinthians 3:1), the Christian life is begun, not finished. Constant prayer for help and guidance, feeding on the sincere milk of the word (1 Peter 2:2), attendance on the means of grace found in the divinely appointed worship meetings of the church--these are requisite for growth in grace and knowledge. It is not the Lord's will that we should always be children; he would that we all should "attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ (Ephesians 4:13). There are two texts which surely are peculiarly appropriate at the close of this study. The first is, "These things write I unto thee ... that thou mayest know how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Timothy 1:14-15). The second is the most glorious passage which the Bible contains concerning the church: "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it; that he might sanctify its having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish" (Ephesians 5:25-27). What a price, cleansing, and destiny!

QUESTIONS.

1. What is the meaning of the word "church"?
2. Name some of the uses of the word "church" or "churches" in the New Testament. Comment on the significance of these.
3. When was the church established?
4. What does Matthew 16:18 tell us of the church's establishment?
5. By whom was the church established?
6. Of what use is the church?
7. Who are members of the church?
8. State the conditions of entrance into the church as implied or stated in Acts 2:1-47.
9. Show from the Scriptures that something more is required than becoming a member of the church.
10. Give and comment on the meaning of some of the titles applied in the New Testament to Christians as individuals.
11. How do we (a) abide in Christ; (b) grow in grace?
12. Why did Jesus give himself for the church?

02.27. THE CHURCH - 03 - Its Worship

THE CHURCH – 03 – Its Worship Reading. 1 Corinthians 11:17-29.

Golden Text. I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.

-- Romans 12:1.

Daily Readings. Acts 2:41-47; Matthew 15:7-9; John 4:23-24; Ephesians 4:1-16; Romans 12:1-10;

1 Timothy 3:1-13; Acts 20:17-35; Luke 18:9-14.

WORSHIP.

"WORSHIP" was formerly used equally of honor shown to men and of adoration and reverence of God. The word is a contraction of worthship (from Anglo-Saxon weorth "worth," with the suffix schipe, English ship, akin to shape). In the earlier translations of the Bible, we have instances of this wider use of the word, e.g., Wyclif had: "Worschipe thi fadir and thi moder: and thou shalt love thi neighbore as thi self" (Matthew 19:19). "Worship" in the Common Version appears as the translation of several Greek words. It is used of the deference or respect which man may fitly give to man; so in Luke 14:10, A.V., "Then shalt thou have worship doxa, (R.V. 'glory') in the presence of them that sit at meat with thee." Two verbs, proskuneo and latreuo, are often found, both being translated "worship." The former may several times be used in the New Testament in the sense of adoration or of prostration before a person, with out any implication of paying divine honor (cf. Matthew 9:18; Acts 10:25, etc.). It has to be noted though that in Acts 10:26; Peter replied to Cornelius, "Rise up, I am also a man"; and we frequently have the word used of honor and adoration of the Divine Being (Matthew 4:10; John 4:23-24; Revelation 22:9, etc.). "Latreuo" (from latris, a workman for hire or hired servant) has the various meanings of to work for hire or pay, to be subject or devoted to, to serve with religious observances; this word is used in the New Testament in the following places among others: Matthew 4:10; Romans 1:9; Php 3:3; Hebrews 9:9; Hebrews 10:2; Hebrews 13:10. We now generally use "worship" with reference to God. It is of course in this sense that it is used in this article. Worship of God is both a privilege and a duty. God grants to his children a token of highest favor when he encourages them to come before him with praise and adoration. It is a privilege reserved for his children. They should ever be grateful for the opportunity of worship, private or public. So much should they have the sense of privilege that there should be no need to emphasize the thought of duty; but unfortunately we are at times slow to respond to the loftier call of privilege, and so need to be reminded of the fact that God expects and requires us to give him worship. This worship is at once for his glory and for his children's good. The Lord Jesus Christ laid down in clear terms the conditions of acceptable worship. He said to the woman of Samaria: "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth" (John 4:24). The Father seeks alone "true worshippers, and these worship "in spirit and truth" (John 4:23).

(a) Worship must be "in spirit," i. e., not merely formal, not with outward observance alone, but inwardly, "with true inward reverence." We can conceive of people being scrupulously exact with regard to times, and places, and acts, and yet having their heart far from right.

(b) Worship must, says Jesus, be "in truth." This means more than sincerity, which is rather included in "in spirit." It may mean "in accordance with the nature of God and our true relations with him as at once Spirit and Father." But we should say that it expresses also the idea that worship "must be in harmony with the truth of God. Just as the first phrase, "in spirit," implies that even the doing of the acts required of God is of no profit if the heart be not in the service so this second requirement, "in truth," tells us that it is not enough to be sincere. Men are often sincerely wrong; it were well that they were sincerely right. God never left it to men to decide how they should approach him, what acts of worship they should perform. He gave in the Old Covenant detailed legislation. In the New Testament we can see his will for us. Men should seek the Lord, now as of old, after the due order (1 Chronicles 15:13). From Paul we gather that it is our duty to "hold fast the traditions," as the apostles delivered them (1 Corinthians 11:2).

(c) Another Scripture shows the need of regarding the teaching of God if we would worship him acceptably. The Lord Jesus declared of the Pharisees that Isaiah's prophecy was fulfilled in them: "In vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men" (Matthew 15:9). On this verse J. W. McGarvey says:

"So far as a man's worship of God is the result of human authority, it springs from an improper source, and is vain. Every human addition to the commandments of God, so far as it induces any worship at all, induces vain worship; and there is probably not one such addition which does not, to a greater or less degree, make some commandment void."

(d) There is a word of the Apostle Paul which is noteworthy here; he speaks of "will-worship" (Colossians 2:23). As Jeremy Taylor puts it, "He that says, God is rightly worshipped by any act or ceremony concerning which himself hath no way expressed his pleasure, is superstitious, or a will-worshipper."

(e) We are warned against performing our religious exercises, or acts of ostensible worship, with a desire to get glory of men. Jesus tells us the passing glory thus obtained is all the profit, for assuredly we shall get no reward of God (Matthew 6:5-6). This is implicitly condemned in the requirement of worship "in spirit."

(f) Yet we must not think that our attitude in worship is so exclusively directed Godwards that our relation to man does not enter into the matter at all. Jesus has told us that our forgiveness of those who do us wrong is a condition of God's hearing our prayer for pardon (Matthew 6:14-15), and that if our brother has aught against us, we must seek to be reconciled to him ere we approach God in worship (Matthew 5:23-24). These passages imply, what is really assumed throughout, that worship is a privilege given to those who are serving God and seeking to live as he would have them.

Worship of God may be either public or private. In our ordinary devotions we worship him. With due reverence and adoration we worship him when we offer our daily prayers when we read his Word, and when we offer him our service. The principles stated above will apply to both kinds. In what follows, we deal with public worship. The New Testament makes it clear that it was the

custom of the early Christians to meet together for worship on the first day of the week. This day was called "the Lord's day." Only in one place in the New Testament do we find it so called (Revelation 1:10). We can easily see why the first day should thus be honored with the title of "Lord's day." On it the Lord Jesus rose triumphant from the grave declared to be the Son of God with power by that resurrection (Romans 1:4); on it he appeared first to his disciples (John 20:19); on it, after a week's interval, he made his second appearance to the disciples (John 20:6) he sent the Spirit to the Apostles on this day (Acts 2:1; cf. Leviticus 23:15-16), the first proclamation of the exaltation and Lordship of the risen Christ was made on the first day; on it the first gospel sermon was preached, on it the church of Christ was established (Acts 2:1-47). We have distinct mention of the Christians meeting for worship on that day (see Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:1-2). We find that it was so, too, in the age immediately after the apostles. The "Didache" (100 to 120 A.D.) refers to the stated breaking of bread on the Lord's day. Justin Martyr in his "Apology" (c. 120 A.D.) records that on the day called Sunday the Christians held a religious service; he tells of the sermon, the reading of the writings of apostles and prophets, the common prayers, and the taking of bread and wine. We have a most instructive passage in Acts 2:42. Though we have no authority for saying that this verse purports to tell the order of service at the stated meetings of the church, yet it does deal with things which enter into the worship service and things which with significant emphasis it says the early Christians "continued steadfastly in." The Christian or the church which wishes to follow Bible example will not disregard that to which men following apostolic instructions steadfastly attend. We have here reference to the teaching, the fellowship, the breaking of the bread, and the prayers. There is not room or necessity for much more than an enumeration of the things which indisputably found a place in the early Christian's meeting for worship on the Lord's day. Prayer.--The Lord Jesus taught its necessity and helpfulness by precept (Matthew 6:9; Luke 18:1), and by example (Luke 3:21; Luke 6:12; Luke 9:18; Luke 9:28-29). He spoke of secret prayer (Matthew 6:6), but attached a special promise to united prayer (Matthew 18:19-20). We find prayers in the church's worship, see 1 Corinthians 14:14-15), which also gives the two-fold character of true prayer--"with the spirit" and "with the understanding." At the close of the prayer, the congregation said "Amen" ("so be it"), indicating that all accepted the petition as theirs and wished it to be answered (1 Corinthians 14:16). Prayer was generally offered to God the Father (Ephesians 3:14) in the name of the Lord Jesus, in harmony with the Savior's words (John 16:23-24); but Sometimes petitions were addresses to the Lord Jesus (Acts 7:59-60; cf. John 14:13-14, R.V.). Praise.--This may have been both by individual utterance (1 Corinthians 14:26) and sung in common. The Lord Jesus and his disciples, the night on which the Supper was instituted, sang a hymn (Matthew 26:30). Hymns, like prayers, were to come from the heart, and were to be intelligently sung (1 Corinthians 14:15); so tunes were not of sole importance. Psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs were sung "to God," though they also helped in the comfort and edification of men (Colossians 3:16). Teaching.--Instruction was doubtless given

(a) through the reading of the Old Testament Scriptures (as was the case in synagogue worship, Acts 13:5). Paul, too, clearly expected his Epistles to be read to the church (1 Thessalonians 5:27; Colossians 4:16).

(b) Oral instruction was also given. The apostles taught (Acts 20:20; 2 Thessalonians 2:15). Some others had the gift of inspired speech or prophecy (1 Corinthians 14:3-4). The gift of prophecy was possessed by women (1 Corinthians 11:5), yet women did not teach in the church (1 Corinthians

14:34; 1 Timothy 2:12). Some excelled in comforting or exhorting, as Barnabas, the "Son of Exhortation" (Acts 11:23). The supreme rule of public speech was that all must be done to edification (1 Corinthians 14:26). There was neither a "one-man ministry" nor a license, miscalled liberty, which made public utterance depend on a sex-qualification alone. All must "edify," and that implies both character and ability.

Contributions.--It may be that "the fellowship" of Acts 2:42 has reference to fellowship in the matter of giving and receiving. We know that the giving of one's material substance is a way of honoring God and a method of worshipping him (Hebrews 13:16; 1 Corinthians 16:1-2). One of the needs of the day is a restoration of the conviction that giving is an act of worship. The Lord's Supper.--The night before his suffering the Lord Jesus instituted a memorial feast. He requested or commanded that his disciples should break the bread and drink the cup in remembrance of him (Luke 22:19-20). It was in loving obedience to this wish that the early church "continued steadfastly in ... the breaking of the bread" (Acts 2:42). Acts 20:7 furnishes the requisite testimony for the day and frequency of its observance. For long after the apostolic age the Christians met every first day of the week (cf. the references previously made to the "Didache" and to Justin Martyr). Acts 20:7 also shows the central purpose of the gathering; the disciples came together to break the bread. They did other things; for instance, they listened until midnight to Paul; but they are not said to have come to hear Paul, but to "break bread." So constant was the custom of weekly celebration, and so central an act of worship was the breaking of bread in remembrance of the Savior in sub-apostolic days, that Chrysostom (died 407 A.D.) called the first day of the week dies panes, or "the day of bread." The evangelists' accounts of the institution (Matthew 26:26-30; Mark 14:22-26; Luke 22:14-23) and the references in 1 Corinthians 10:14-22; 1 Corinthians 11:23-30, should be carefully studied. We have there set forth the purpose of the feast. It is a feast of commemoration. The Savior's body and blood are symbolized by the bread and wine. It is a communion. It is a pledge of brotherly love. It is a sign of unity (1 Corinthians 10:17). It is a means of preaching the gospel (1 Corinthians 11:26) If we remember that our Lord and our loving Savior, who knew our frame, our needs, and our weaknesses, instituted the worship of the church for our good, we shall see to it that we never neglect the means of grace, the spiritual food he has provided. We require constant and regular food and help. The injunction to forsake not the assembling of ourselves together (Hebrews 10:25) is as pertinent now as it ever was.

02.28. THE CHURCH - 04 - Its Ministry

THE CHURCH – 04 – Its Ministry

In the widest sense the ministers of the church are all who in any way serve the church, for the word "minister" means "servant." All service of God or his church is honorable and blessed. We should find our highest joy in the imitation of Christ, who came to minister (Matthew 20:28). Who was in the midst of his disciples as One that served (Luke 22:27). The Lord Jesus has told us that the way to greatness is the way of service. He who is great, serves; he who is greatest is bondservant of all (Mark 10:43-44). "Divine service" is a term whose widest use is rare. It is service we celebrate when we come together and worship in the manner specified above; but it is also divine service when in any way we try to serve Christ. "Whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Colossians 3:17). But we also rightly use the word "ministry" in a more limited sense. It is clear from the New Testament that special duties devolved upon appointed persons. The Lord's work is varied in character, and, as was fitting and orderly, a division of labor was made. There was no special ministerial class or caste. There was not for many years after the apostolic age anything like the modern distinction between clergy and laity. Above all, it must be noted that there was no sacerdotal class, claiming to have exclusive right to exercise priestly functions. This idea was derived from the priesthood of the Old Testament, and was illegitimately transferred to the New. All Christians are priests unto God, and offer up spiritual sacrifices (1 Peter 2:5; 1 Peter 2:9). Jesus Christ himself is now our sole Priest in a sense other than that belonging to all Christians; he is the only Mediator between God and man (1 Timothy 2:5). The pretensions of modern sacerdotalism are false, unscriptural and even blasphemous in that they transgress on the prerogatives of our Lord. The ministry of the church is often divided into two classes: Extraordinary, including apostles and prophets. Ordinary, of which the chief subdivisions are evangelists, elders and deacons. It cannot be said that these classes were necessarily exclusive; e.g., Peter was both an apostle and an elder (1 Peter 1:1; 1 Peter 5:1). Apostles.--The word "apostle" means "messenger," "envoy," "one sent." We have the word specially used (a) of Christ himself (Hebrews 3:1). Jesus, we know, was "sent" from God (John 3:16):

(b) the twelve apostles chosen by Jesus from the company of his disciples--Peter, Andrew, James, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, Thaddaeus, Simon the Cananaean, and Judas Iscariot (Matthew 10:2-4). Judas betrayed Jesus and committed suicide (Matthew 27:5). To fill the vacancy, Matthias was appointed, and "was numbered with the eleven apostles" (Acts 1:15-26). Later, Saul of Tarsus had a special call from the risen Christ to be his apostle (Acts 26:14-18); he was as one born out of due time (1 Corinthians 15:8).

(c) We have others called apostles e. g., Barnabas, who is so named in conjunction with Paul (Acts 14:14; cf. Php 2:25; 2 Corinthians 8:23). These may have been so called because they were "sent forth" by the churches.

We have chiefly to notice the apostles of Christ. They were chosen to be the instruments of founding and guiding the affairs of the church. We notice that they were specially qualified for this great work.

(a) They had all personal knowledge of Christ, and could give direct witness of what they had seen and heard. (See John 15:27; Acts 1:21-22; 1 Corinthians 9:1; 1 Corinthians 15:8).

(b) They were chosen by Christ himself (Matthew 10:1-5; Acts 1:24; Acts 9:15; Acts 22:14).

(c) They were inspired by the Holy Spirit, so that their words came with all the force of the word of God. Apostolic authority depended on this. To hear the apostles is to hear Christ; to reject their word is to reject him (Luke 10:16; Matthew 16:19; cf. John 20:23). See our fourth lesson dealing with the Holy Spirit's work of inspiration, and with the baptism in the Spirit. John 16:13-14, and 1 Corinthians 2:6-16 may suffice for reference here. In our New Testament Scriptures we have the benefits of this inspiration.

(d) The apostles had miraculous powers which helped to corroborate their testimony (Acts 2:43; Acts 5:12; Acts 14:9-10, etc.). Because of the fact that we do not find men now who have the above qualifications, as well as the blessed truth that the New Testament gives us the teaching and guidance of the apostles, we do not believe in apostolic succession. There is no hint in the Bible of it. The apostles as such--from the very nature of the case, it is evident--had no successors.

Prophets.--A prophet is a forth-teller, one who speaks on behalf of another or in another's name. In the Bible prophecy is used to denote inspired speech. We have the gift of prophecy as a miraculous endowment of the Spirit (Romans 12:6; 1 Corinthians 14:1-40). Prophets foretold events (Acts 11:27-28); this was a consequence of their inspiration, and their prophesying was not confined to this. They exhorted and edified the church (Acts 15:32; 1 Corinthians 14:1-4). The gift of prophecy was sometimes bestowed on women (Acts 21:9; 1 Corinthians 11:5). We come now to what we believe to be the permanent ministry of the church. Evangelists.--The derivation of this word shows its meaning; an evangelist is a publisher of glad news or good tidings. The Greek word for "evangelist" occurs only three times in the New Testament (Acts 21:8; Ephesians 4:11; 2 Timothy 4:5). The Greek word for "evangelize" occurs more than fifty times (see, e.g., Luke 1:19; Luke 2:10; Luke 8:1; Acts 13:32; 1 Thessalonians 3:6; Revelation 10:7). These passages show that evangelizing was not the prerogative of a few members of the church, or a work from which others were excluded. Yet it is clear that some were so devoted to this work as to derive from it the distinctive name of "evangelist." Philip and Timothy were such. The function of the evangelist was to preach the gospel. The converts made through the preaching he would baptize and gather together, encouraging them to observe the things the Savior commanded (Matthew 28:20) and to attend to the worship appointed for their spiritual good. He would naturally care for this congregation or church until elders and deacons were appointed. The evangelists of primitive times may generally have had some special endowment of the Spirit, some "spiritual gift"; and this has suggested to some that, since the miraculous endowments have ceased, therefore the office of evangelist itself has ceased. The reasoning is hardly cogent. The work of an evangelist is as necessary to-day as it ever was, and must be done: he who is devoted to it, who makes it his life's work to evangelize or proclaim the good news of the gospel, is an evangelist. We now notice some men whose office was a local one, whose work lay with the local congregation in a sense in which

that of the apostles, prophets, and evangelists did not. Bishops or Elders.--The Greek word "bishop" (or "overseer") is found five times in the New Testament (Acts 20:28; Php 1:1; 1 Timothy 3:2; Titus 1:7; 1 Peter 2:25). The word for "elder" is much more frequently used, sometimes of the Jewish elders (Matthew 15:2; Matthew 26:57); sometimes of the elders in Revelation (4:4, 19:4, etc.), often a special body of men in the New Testament church (Acts 14:23; Acts 20:17; 1 Timothy 5:1; 1 Timothy 5:17; 1 Timothy 5:19; Titus 1:5; James 5:14). These two names "bishop" and "elder" were names of the same class of men, and did not apply to distinct offices; this may be seen from various Scriptures:

(a) Php 1:1 addresses "bishops and deacons." An intermediate class of elders, had there been one, could hardly have been overlooked.

(b) Acts 20:17; Acts 20:28. The "elders" of Acts 20:17 are the "bishops" of Acts 20:28.

(c) 1 Timothy 3:2-7 has for the "bishop" the qualifications laid down for "elders" in Titus 1:6-9. These men were also called "pastors" or "shepherds" (Ephesians 4:11), for they had to feed the flock of God; the verb, corresponding to the noun in Ephesians 4:11, is used of the bishops in Acts 20:28 and of the elders in 1 Peter 5:2.

We note that there were in the New Testament churches a number of elders. There was no such thing in apostolic days as a bishop with authority over a diocese containing many congregations; the one church had, instead, a plurality of bishops (see Acts 14:23; cf. Titus 1:5). The former of these passages shows that it would be wrong to say that there cannot be a church after the New Testament pattern without an eldership; these, and the other Scriptures referred to, show, I think, that there cannot be a church fully and scripturally organised without an eldership. The qualifications of elders or bishops are very fully and explicitly laid down in 1 Timothy 3:2-7 and Titus 1:6-9. The list of qualifications is an instructive one, if only from the point of view of showing what character a Christian man, a pattern to others, may be expected to have. A bishop or elder must be--blameless, husband of one wife, possessed of faithful children, a good ruler of his own house, vigilant, not self-willed, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, a lover of good men, just, holy, patient, temperate, not given to wine, not greedy of filthy lucre, not covetous, not soon angry, no striker, not a brawler, well reported of by folk who are not Christians, not a novice, holding fast the word, apt to teach. Since no mere man is perfect, it is obvious that these requirements must not be interpreted so absolutely as to make an eldership impossible. The duties of bishops are seen in the foregoing. They had charge of the spiritual affairs of the church. They watched over souls for whom they expected to give account to God. They ruled (1 Timothy 5:7), yet did not lord it over God's heritage (1 Peter 5:3). They taught (1 Timothy 3:2). These duties are permanent and the church's welfare depends on their being faithfully attended to. Deacons.--The word "deacon" means "servant," "waiter" or "minister." The Greek word diakonos is used in the New Testament of Christ (Romans 15:8); the apostles (Matthew 20:26; 1 Corinthians 3:5; 2 Corinthians 3:6); evangelists (1 Timothy 4:6); any faithful servant of the Lord (John 12:26); magistrates (Romans 13:4); waiters at feasts (Matthew 22:13; John 2:5; John 2:9); an attendant (Luke 4:20); emissaries of Satan (2 Corinthians 11:15). But the word was used in a special sense of men holding a particular office in the church (Php 1:1). Acts 6:1-7 and 1 Timothy 3:8-12 should be consulted as to the qualifications and work of these men. Apparently they had charge of the secular affairs of the church. They did not rule; that was the elders' work (1 Timothy 5:17), they were servants. Their

work was honorable and important; not just any man could do it; the qualifications demand faithful men, spiritually minded, sound in the faith, an example in life to others. To serve the Lord or his church is an honor: "They that have served well as deacons gain to themselves & good standing, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus" (1 Timothy 3:13). Deaconesses.--In Romans 16:1 Phoebe is spoken of as a servant of the church which is at Cenchrae. The word used is diakonos, deaconess or servant. It is impossible to be certain that there was a special office of deaconess in the apostolic church, but Romans 16:1, read in light of the obvious fact that women could fittingly and well minister to their own sex, makes it highly probable. The "women" of 1 Timothy 3:11 (R.V.) are by many thought to be deaconesses: we cannot definitely say so. Widows. Some include the widows of 1 Timothy 5:9-15 among the "deaconesses." The identification is possible, but is really gratuitous. That these "widows" were a special class rendering service and supported by the church, is practically certain. The qualification and age-limit forbid our reading the passage with reference to applicants for church membership or to recipients of pecuniary aid from the church. Helps and Governments are referred to in 1 Corinthians 12:28 but it is impossible to prove that the apostle has in mind offices rather than functions. It may be, as Hort suggests, that "helps" are "anything that could be done for poor or weak or outcast brethren, either by rich or powerful or influential brethren, or by the devotions of those who stood on no such eminence," while "governments" refers to "men who by wise counsels did for the community what the steersman or pilot does for the ship." The Greek words for "helps" and "governments" are in the New Testament found in this passage only.

QUESTIONS.

1. What is meant by worship? 2. What are the conditions of acceptable worship? 3. Did the early church have any stated time for worship? Give Scriptural references illustrating answer. 4. What acts of worship are expected of us? 5. What is taught in the New Testament concerning our hymns of praise? 6. Why was the Supper instituted? How often should Christians attend to it? 7. Name the apostles. What do you know of the work and authority of the apostles of Christ? 8. What are bishops, and what their duties? 9. State the qualifications of an elder 10. What are the qualifications and work of deacons? 11. What did prophets do? 12. What is meant by "evangelist"? What were the duties of evangelists?

03.00.1. Studes in Ambiguous Texts

Messages from the Word.

Studies in Ambiguous Texts. By A. R. MAIN, M. A.

Principal, College of the Bible, Glen Iris, Victoria.

Editor, "The Australian Christian."

Registered by the Postmaster-General for transmission through the post as a Book.

Wholly set up and printed in Australia by The Austral Printing & Publishing Co. Ltd.

528, 530 Elizabeth St., Melbourne.

1928.

03.00.2. FOREWORD.

FOREWORD.

Memory takes me back across the years to an evening when I sat in our home on the farm at the feet of an itinerant preacher, and listened to his words of counsel. The family reading for the evening (there was always family reading) was John 21:1-25. After the reading the visitor conversed on the ambiguity of the question, "Lovest thou me more than these?" I was but a country lad, and had had few opportunities of hearing expositions of Scripture passages, and I listened eagerly to the preacher as he expounded this passage. The incident made an indelible impression on my mind, and helped to create an interest in the rich veins of truth that the Scriptures present for our study. This is a peculiarity of the Word of God--that its richest treasures do not all lie on the surface, to be discovered and appropriated by any casual passer-by. The ambiguity of some passages, which to the objector is an occasion for criticism, is to the devout reader a source of ever-increasing interest. "God hath yet more light and truth to break from his holy word." A diligent study of the Scriptures results in ever-increasing discoveries of the inexhaustible sources of instruction the book contains. In the following studies A. B. Main, M.A., has brought to his readers the results of wide re-search and clear thinking. Principal Main's long experience as an instructor in the courses in the New Testament at the College of the Bible have prepared him to an unusual degree to become an expositor of the Word, and the pen of a ready writer has enabled him clearly to express the results of his investigations. The studies are a unique addition to our literature of Bible exposition. They will be of value in Bible Classes and other meetings where the Scriptures are studied, and will be appreciated by individuals who love to search the deep things of God.

T. H. Scambler.

03.00.3. Table of Contents

CONTENTS.

Introductory

On Searching the Scriptures

Nil Desperandum

The Question Peter Would Not Answer

"Tears, Idle Tears"

The Gift of the Holy Spirit

On Giving Up Our Rights

One Thing Needful

The Lord's Prayer

Making Friends of the Mammon of Unrighteousness

The Word's First Word

"Why Callest Thou Me Good?"

"Baptised for the Dead"

"Sound Doctrine"

Mirrored Glory and Transformed Life

Glory of God and Peace of Man

Faith and Its Assurance

Light Which Lighteth Every Man

"Not . . . But"

"To the Uttermost"

03.01. Introductory

Introductory

"Oh, how I love thy law! It is my meditation all the day." It would mean much for his own spiritual well-being and for the advancement of the church of God if every Christian could truthfully make the announcement of the Psalmist. For it remains true, as the ancient Scriptures taught, and as our Lord Jesus Christ declared, that "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

"Father of mercies, in thy word What endless glory shines! For ever be thy name adored For these celestial lines. "Here the fair tree of knowledge grows, And yields a free repast; Sublimers sweets than nature knows Invite the longing taste."

"Hard to be understood."

We have the authority of an apostle of Christ for the view that in the Scriptures are "some things hard to be understood." There need be no wonder at this. The way of salvation is made so plain that "the wayfaring man, though unlearned, shall not err therein." The vital things are most clearly revealed, and no one of humblest estate is so handicapped by lack of leisure, wealth or learning, that he may not know enough to have the blessed assurance of redemption through Jesus Christ his Lord. But yet the Scriptures are to us as an inexhaustible mine of wealth much of which can only be extracted by diligent and unremitting labor. Why should we expect all to be easy here, when we have to earn our daily bread in the sweat of our brow? Seeing there is need of the most painstaking study and application on the part of one who would advance in scientific knowledge and read the lessons of "Nature's infinite book of secrecy," why should there not be a similar demand for diligence, and even strenuous study on the part of those who would understand the riches of grace, the treasures of divine wisdom, hidden in the Scriptures? It is not unreasonable that Peter should write that "the ignorant and unstedfast" wrest the hard sayings of Scripture "unto their own destruction." The numerous conflicting interpretations of Scripture heal, witness, in part, to the inherent difficulty of the sayings. They may more often be attributed to ignorance and lack of stedfastness on the part of the interpreters. Our present writing, however, is not concerned with such passages. It is our purpose to give a series of studies of texts which can legitimately be rendered or interpreted in more than one way. The student of Holy Scripture knows that there are many such passages. It may be of interest to those who cannot give much time to minute study of the text, or who are wont to read from one version alone to deal with some of these "ambiguous texts".

Variant readings.

Sometimes the varieties of renderings given in the different translations are due to the fact that the readings of the manuscripts vary. No New Testament manuscript extant goes back beyond the fourth century. That there are many divergent readings is not surprising, and the fact is made plain in the marginal readings and references of our English Revised Version. Some of the differences

in the texts of the common and revised versions, and again in the English revision as compared with the American Standard Revised Version, are due to the adoption by the translators of different Greek readings. In Moffatt's New Translation, again, we occasionally have renderings and alterations due to his choice of a Greek text which was not adopted by most other translators. Instances of variant readings both in Old Testament and New will readily occur to most readers. The omission from our Revised Version of such passages as Acts 8:37, John 5:4, 1 John 5:7, and Matthew 18:11, is due to the fact that the revisers felt that the great weight of manuscript authority was against the readings. The familiar words of "the Lord's Prayer," "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever, Amen" are for a like reason excluded from Matthew's record. Similarly, the third petition of the prayer ("Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth") and the words "Deliver us from the evil one," are omitted from Luke's account, though "many ancient authorities" include them. Many such instances occur. Where there is not omission, there may be great variation. For instance, the remarkable difference between the common and the revised rendering of Jude 1:22-23 is largely due to uncertainty in the reading of the Greek text. In Mark 7:4 our translation has the words "wash themselves" where the American version has the more definite "bathe"--each being given as a rendering of the Greek word "baptize" but the marginal note indicates that there is an alternative Greek rendering "sprinkle themselves." Curiously, this has led some to think that our translators meant that the Greek word "baptizo" could legitimately be translated by "sprinkle," than which nothing can be more unfounded. The contrary is the case; some manuscripts have "rantizo," which of course would be translated by "sprinkle"; but our translators (English or American) did not suggest that "baptizo" could possibly be so translated.

Ambiguities and doubtful applications.

There are in the Greek text ambiguities of construction. This is not strange, for we have similar ambiguities in English and other languages. Shakespeare's line, "The Duke yet lives that Henry shall depose," is a well-known example of amphiboly or ambiguity of structure. There are similar ambiguities in the New Testament. One of the best known of these is "Lovest thou me more than these?" which will later be dealt with in detail.

Some ambiguous texts are of a different kind. The application of a word may be doubtful. For instance, the word "pneuma" is used of the human spirit and of the Holy Spirit. It is not easy in some places to say whether the reference is to the divine or the human. Our translators have indicated the difference by the use of the capital "S" where in their judgment the Holy Spirit is meant. The great majority of the passages are clear and simple, but in some cases there is ambiguity. An excellent illustration is found in Romans 8:4-5. Our English Revised Version reads: "That the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the spirit the things of the spirit." The Common Version and the American Standard Revised Version both read "Spirit." All three versions make Romans 8:9 ("if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his") refer to the Holy Spirit, though many preachers in their sermons on this text wrongfully speak as if "the Spirit of Christ" merely meant his character or disposition. The three versions named all again agree that 1 Corinthians 2:12 should read: "We received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God." The word is "pneuma" in each case. A similar confusion may arise with the word "psukee," which stands either for "soul" or "life." Compare, for example, the following passages in common and revised versions: Matthew 10:28, Matthew 10:39; Matthew

16:25-26; Mark 8:35-37; Luke 9:24-25; in each case the word "life" or "soul" is the translation of "psukee." Other cases will probably readily occur to the reader. In this series of studies we wish chiefly to consider another kind of alternative readings, viz., those due not to divergent readings in the Greek texts, but to the fact that there are various ways of rendering the one text. Every student of language knows that there may be several equally legitimate translations of the same text. Hence our different helpful English versions of the Bible.

Meanings change.

Some of our variant translations and interpretations are due to the fact that language grows and words change their meanings. This is so with English words, and explains some of the alterations made in our Revised Version. "By and by" now means "after a time"; in 1611, when King James's version was issued, it meant "at once" or "forthwith" (compare C.V. and R.V. of Mark 6:25). "Prevent" once meant to "come before" or "anticipate" and has this meaning in 1 Thessalonians 4:15 where the Revised Version rightly renders "precede." The "let" of 2 Thessalonians 2:7 used to mean "hinder"; hence the revised reading "restraineth."

Similarly Greek words changed their meaning with the passing centuries. Sometimes it is difficult to decide between the older and newer meanings, and hence the text is to us ambiguous. In part, the meaning of the phrase in the Commission relating to baptism is thus open to question. Is the baptism "into" or "in" the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? The Revised Version gives the former rendering, which seems to give a much richer meaning. Another case is found in Luke 6:35, where the revisers substituted for the common reading "hoping for nothing again" the more significant words "never despairing." We shall later deal more specifically with this interesting passage.

Some texts are ambiguous to us because of the lack of punctuation marks in the Greek manuscripts. We to-day may indicate the difference between a question and a statement both by the insertion of a mark of interrogation at the end, or by a variation in the order of the words. Even without the interrogation point, no one could fail to discriminate between these sentences--"He did eat" and "Did he eat." But with Greek it was not so. If we had had the interrogation point in our admittedly correct text, there could be no question whether 1 Corinthians 1:13 should be translated "Christ is divided" or "Is Christ divided?" Yet see R.V. margin. It is because of this kind of ambiguity that some ingenious interpreters have, quite unnecessarily and rather quaintly, sought to get rid of the well known difficulty in connection with Christ's cursing of the barren fig-tree by altering the translation of Mark 11:13 from "it was not the season of figs" to "was it not the season of figs?"

We are not suggesting that where there is ambiguity in the structure of a sentence, there is no way of arriving definitely at the meaning. The context may make the reference quite plain.

Ours the difficulty.

It should be noted, also, that the texts which are ambiguous to us were not necessarily so to the persons to whom they were originally written or spoken. With spoken words the tone or emphasis may assist to make the meaning plain. Take, for instance, the written question, "Did you walk to Melbourne yesterday morning?" According as the speaker accentuates different words, that question has seven different meanings; but when spoken by anyone the emphasis would indicate

the precise inquiry, and elicit the appropriate answer. Again, the current meanings of terms, and shades of expression, would be familiar to those who read the New Testament writings or listened to the teaching of Christ and his apostles, as they are not known to us. At times, a gesture or look would illuminate the expression. Thus, doubtless, all ambiguity would be banished from the question of Jesus to Peter, "Lovest thou me more than these?" Probably, also, would this have obviated any difficulty in that much discussed statement of Christ's, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church."

It will frequently be the case that in whichever possible and legitimate way we read an ambiguous passage we can derive helpful and beautiful lessons from it. So the loss need not be great even if we cannot wholly remove the ambiguity. In our studies, we shall attempt to put fairly the differing views and the supplementary lessons drawn from the texts, while at the same time we shall indicate a preference and give reasons for one reading rather than another. Our attitude. As we approach the Sacred Oracles once again, and seek to understand the divine truths therein revealed for our growth in grace and knowledge, the appropriate prayer of our heart may be that expressed in Charles Wesley's hymn:

"Inspirer of the ancient seers, Who wrote from thee the sacred page, The same through all succeeding years, To us, in our degenerate age, The spirit of thy word impart, And breathe the life into our heart. "While now thine oracles we read, With earnest prayer and strong desire; Oh, let thy Spirit from thee proceed, Our souls to awaken and inspire, Our weakness help, our darkness chase, And guide us by the light of grace. "Furnished out of thy treasury, Oh, may we always ready stand To help the souls redeemed by thee, In what the various states demand; To teach, convince, correct, reprove, And build them up in holiest love."

03.02. On Searching the Scriptures.

On Searching the Scriptures.

John 5:39.

There is no more familiar verse of Scripture than John 5:39, and no exhortation is more common or more needful than "Search the Scriptures." So constant and simple is this reading of the famous passage that some Christians may wonder at our including the verse among ambiguous texts. The reason will be apparent if the Revised Version, both text and margin, is read. The verse is thus translated:

"Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they that bear witness of me." The marginal reading (Or, "Search the Scriptures") reproduces the rendering of the common version. One of these translations of the word used by Christ is as legitimate as the other. The Greek verb is "ereunate," and may be either imperative ("Search") or indicative ("Ye search"). The need of Bible study. When an earnest preacher pleads with people to "Search the Scriptures," he is giving excellent advice, and indicating one of the great needs of the Christian world. The Bible is not studied as once it was. It is not even read very much. We used to warn people against reading books about the Bible rather than the Bible itself. Even that warning may miss the mark in this busy and pleasure-loving age. No one can "grow in grace and knowledge" who neglects the Book of God. Our Saviour nourished his own soul on the Scriptures, and re-affirmed that man lives not by bread alone but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God. The Apostle Paul tells us that the Scriptures are able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. They are profitable for instruction in righteousness, and are given that the man of God may be complete and furnished completely unto every good work. So nobody can be complete or completely furnished who neglects the sacred writings. The verse penned on the fly-leaf of John Richard Green's Bible sets forth a truth:

"These hath God married, And no man doth part-- Dust on the Bible, And drought in the heart."

"I fear you are ill," said Dr. Latham to Faraday, whom he found in tears with his hand resting on an open book. "It is not that," said Faraday with a sob; "but why will people go astray when they have this blessed book to guide them?" The duty of right searching. The fifth chapter of John furnishes a good illustration of the fact that the ambiguity which lurks in a word or text when taken by itself may be completely and satisfactorily removed by a study of the context. There need be no real doubt that it is the revised translation, "Ye search the Scriptures," which is correct. So certainly is this the right rendering that we confess to a feeling both of surprise and of pain to find preachers and writers obscuring the meaning of the passage by using the other reading. We have heard a Conference Sermon on the duty of Bible study, based on John 5:39, and on the common rendering. It is a pity to begin a carefully prepared address on such a theme with an obvious misinterpretation. Before us lies a book containing helpful interpretations of texts "hard to be understood." The distinguished and scholarly author puts in the preface the following sentences:

"We are told to 'search the Scriptures' (John 5:39). We are not merely to read, but to 'search' for hidden treasures. The meaning of Scripture does not always lie on the surface . . . No attention we pay can be too great or too minute, for the smallest points of Holy Writ have often a deep meaning." The sentiment is excellent, but these lessons are not found in John 5:39.

Few better working rules can be given to a speaker than that he see that his homiletics harmonize with his exegesis. It is well to resist the temptation to strain a text, or give it a twist in order to illustrate a point or make a sermonic hit. If we wish to inculcate the duty and helpfulness of Bible reading, there are other excellent texts awaiting our use. The Jews whom Jesus condemned in the address reported in John 5 did search the Scriptures. Those who were destined to be lawyers or rabbis devoted very much time to their study. The scribes, as their name denoted, mere "scripturalists," and their ideal office was to search into the meaning of the Scriptures. He who so searched felt that he was sure of life everlasting. Rabbi Hillel said, "The more law, the more life." Yet all their study availed little. Though searching the sacred books because they thought that in them they had life, they yet rejected the Christ of whom those very Scriptures testified. Herein is the pathos and tragedy of the Jews' position. They boasted of their privilege as possessors of the oracles of God (the first "advantage" of the Jew; see Romans 3:2). They professed to reverence these oracles, and certainly they studied them but they missed the meaning of the message. They looked and prayed for the advent of the Messiah, yet knew him not and crucified him when he came. So Christ says: "Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me; and ye will not come to me, that ye may, have life." "The intense, misplaced diligence is contrasted with the futile result." The true function of Scripture. Our great text teaches it's the true function of Scripture, viz., to testify of Christ and to lead men to him. The Jews believed that in the careful study of the Scriptures, and in the laborious keeping with minute scrupulosity of the requirements of the law, they would find life eternal; but the purpose of God was that the Scriptures should prepare for Jesus Christ, his Son, and lead to him, as the real source of spiritual life. No one who uses the Scriptures aright can possibly study them too diligently or prize them too highly. But not even the study of Scripture is an end in itself. Dr. Marcus Dods gave the following continent on John 5:39 : " The true function of Scripture is expressed in the words, 'these are they which bear witness of me'; they do not give life, as the Jews thought; they lead to the life-giver. God speaks in Scripture with a definite purpose in view, to testify to Christ; if Scripture does that it does all. But to set it on a level with Christ is to do both it, him, and ourselves grave injustice." The Scriptures, the church, the ordinances of our Lord's appointment, must be prized and cherished by every Christian. They are all means, however, and not ends in themselves. Very many of the errors in the realms of religion and morals are due to the turning of means into ends. We do not have life in ordinance, or Bible, or church: we have life in Christ. We need these because we must have him.

There is a perennial lesson for its all in the well-known text of our study. O the tragedy--to profess to love the Book, and yet not to come to him in whom life is to be found; to know of Christ as revealed in the Scriptures, and yet not to "know him" whom to know is life eternal.

John 5:39 is not so much an injunction to search the Scriptures as it is a warning against Scripture searching to little purpose.

03.03. Nil Desperandum.

Nil Desperandum.

Luke 6:35. In one of the most practical sections of the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord Jesus Christ told his disciples to succor the needy, give to the beggar, and lend freely to those from whom no gain could be expected. Followers of Christ must not be content with the lower standards of others. Sinners love their friends, do good to those who do good to them, and "lend to sinners to receive again as much." To his disciples Jesus gave the following command and promise:

"Love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest; for he is kind to the unthankful, and to the evil" (Luke 6:35, Common Version). The difficulty of an ideal.

While we are here dealing with ambiguities and difficulties in interpretation, it has to be allowed that the greatest difficulty with such a text is the loftiness of the ideal set before us. Which of us can truth fully claim to be carrying out in daily life, as we should, the principles of the Sermon on the Mount? We are told to love our enemies, bless those who curse us, "give to every man that asketh," and "as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." Many unbelievers admire the Sermon on the Mount, but doubt its practicability for a world such as this. But what of Christians? Dare they dismiss the words of the Lord as impracticable, or neglect them in daily life? When we are tempted to disregard the teaching as too idealistic let us remember the solemn close of the Sermon. Our Lord said that whosoever hears and does "these sayings of mine" is wise and like a man who builds on the rock to the salvation of his house; while he who hears and does not is foolish as the man who was involved in inevitable ruin when the floods overwhelmed his house built on the sands. We use this illustration to convince sinners of the duty of primary obedience to the gospel; but let us not forget that the words were given in an address to disciples, and the warning is against our neglect of "these sayings" which include the difficult rules we have quoted. The general meaning.

There is no need to press Christ's words to a grotesque extreme, as if with absolute literalness we should allow every hefty vagabond to despoil our goods, and should become the prey of every smooth liar who cares to pitch a tale and wheedle a gift or loan. But scarcely anyone is tempted to that extreme. We are all much more likely to do the opposite, and withhold our compassion and our gifts from the needy. After all, our Lord meant something. His rules about lending to the poor without hope of repayment cannot be dismissed by quoting the essentially worldly-wise advice of Polonius to his son:

"Neither a borrower nor a lender be; For loan oft loses both itself and friend, And borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry."

We must not, in order to excuse ourselves, explain Christ's words by explaining them away. It does not follow that we must either give a foolish interpretation to them, or, on the other hand, justify stinginess. We may be quite right in condemning indiscriminate charity given without care

and examination; but we must be willing to sacrifice time and money for the helping of our fellows. Christ enjoins a constant willingness to "do good" to others; when gifts and loans will not do good but harm, then they are not enjoined upon us. Till then, as we have the ability, we must seek to help the poor and needy, as brethren of ours and of our Lord. We cannot at once be selfish and Christian.

"Hoping for nothing again."

It is one phrase, particularly, which brings Luke 6:35 into our present series. According to the Common Version, Jesus said: "Lend, hoping for nothing again." Our English Revised Version and the American Standard Revision both translate, "Lend, never despairing"; while both in the margin indicate that a slight variation in the Greek text of some manuscripts should be translated "despairing of no man." The words of the received text are "meedena apelpizontes" The marginal rendering follows the reading "meedena apelpizontes." All English versions prior to the Revised Version are said to have adopted the common view that "apelpizontes," a word used once only in the New Testament, means "hoping for in return." This rendering is based not on the meaning of the word elsewhere found, but on the supposed requirements of the context in Luke 6:1-49.

It is clear that "hoping for nothing again" both fits the context admirably, and makes quite good sense in itself. That it suits the context is easily seen. The Saviour in Luke 6:30 bids us to give, and adds, "Of him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again." In Luke 6:34 he deprecates the lending "to them of whom ye hope to receive," saying that "even sinners lend to sinners, to receive again as much." An injunction to "lend, hoping for nothing again" would follow on very naturally. The advice, too, is good in itself. It forbids a practice and a spirit all too common. Men do good to get good. They give hospitality to receive greater hospitality. There are social aspirants who reduce to a fine art the throwing out of sprats to catch mackerels. The Lord Jesus forbids such practices absolutely to his disciples. Their benevolence must be disinterested. They work for no earthly advantage, no human approval, no repayment from men.

If any reader decides to stand by the common translation he need not feel either lonely or ashamed. Rotherham's Emphasised Bible ("hoping for nothing back"), Weymouth's New Testament in Modern Speech ("without hoping for any repayment"), and Moffatt's New Translation ("without expecting any return") all harmonise with the reading of the Common Version; and it would be absurd for us to scorn such an array of authorities.

"Never despairing."

Yet we must express a preference for the reading of the Revised Version. Apparently Jesus really said, "Love your enemies, and do [them] good, and lend, never despairing." In his excellent "Word Studies," Vincent, referring to the original meaning of "apelpizo" ("to give up in despair"), calls attention to the use of the word in this sense in the Greek version of the Old Testament and in the Apocrypha. In 2Ma 9:18 we have "despairing of his health," and in Jdt 9:11 "a saviour of them that are without hope." The verb and its kindred adjective are used by medical writers to describe desperate cases of sickness. Milligan in his "Vocabulary of the Greek Testament" quotes a phrase describing the "faith cure" of a man who had been "given up." The disciple in his good work is never to give up in despair. How often we wonder if we are wasting time on things and folk? What Christian worker but has occasionally asked, "Is this thing worth the effort? In helping people who

will neither appreciate nor respond, it is easy to despair. We may think that our time is wasted, the money we give is wholly lost, and the man we assist is beyond recovery. But Christ says: "Do good," "lend, never despairing." It is a needed lesson. "As it stands it gives this sense, 'Lend, and though appearances may be unfavorable, despair not of being repaid,' because you are lending not to man only, but to the Lord,' who will assuredly repay what you have laid out." Your charity has in it a hope of profitable return, not on earth, perhaps, but certainly from your heavenly Father, whose recompense never fails.

If "meedena" be the right reading, then "despairing of no one" doubtless is the correct rendering, though some competent scholars declare that with this reading the meaning would be "causing no one to despair" by refusing aid. While this translation does not commend itself to us, it illustrates once more the familiar fact that excellent lessons attach themselves to varying renderings and readings.

Dr. G. R. Bliss, the Baptist commentator, has an interesting note on "never despairing." This, he says, "gives a better text than the Common Version, for charity sermons; but let anniversary preachers and the representatives of benevolent institutions note how and where the reward for Christian benevolence is to be paid. The Saviour's compensation for service to him, and sacrifices in his cause, is better than worldly good, it is an increase of the spirit of beneficence and sacrifice to all eternity."

Sir George Trevelyan paid a fine tribute to the character of Zachary Macaulay, father of the more famous Lord Macaulay. After speaking of "the unwearied patience with which he managed the colonies of negroes at Sierra Leone," he remarked: "He was not fretted by the folly of others, or irritated by their hostility, because he regarded the humblest or the worst of mankind as objects, equally with himself, of the divine love and care." How excellently this suits our Lord's words in Luke 6 can be seen by any reader. As we are tempted to despair of others, let us remember how we must all appear in the sight of God, how wayward and unresponsive. "He is kind toward the unthankful and evil," and we are but asked to imitate him to the extent of our ability. To quote Dr. G. R. Bliss once more: "How few of all the race of men could have lived and had opportunity of happiness, had their Creator and Preserver looked for worthiness and gratitude, not to say recompense, in them!"

03.04. The Question Peter Would Not Answer.

The Question Peter Would Not Answer.

John 21:15. The character of Simon Peter ever attracts us. His numerous faults, his blundering impetuosity and his impulsive love make him wondrously human, and appeal greatly to men. We feel that he is one of ourselves. That Jesus could turn Simon into Peter, the weak denier of his Name into the strong Rock Apostle is one of the wonders of divine grace, and a most encouraging thing to any disciple who is painfully conscious of his weakness.

Few passages of Scripture are more familiar or more dear than that in which "the disciple whom Jesus loved" tells the story of the rehabilitation of his friend who had in an agony of fears repented of his denial of the Master. It is with one sentence of the story recorded in John 21:1-25 that we now deal. Jesus asked: "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these?" This question of our Lord is one of the best examples of an ambiguous text. With the Greek text there is precisely the same ambiguity as with the English. So far as grammar is concerned, the meaning might be either "Lovest thou me more than these other disciples love me?" or "Lovest thou me more than thou lovest these?"--"these" in this case referring to the boat and nets and the old fisherman's life generally. We must grant to interpreters the right to stand by either construction, so far as the verse by itself is concerned. There is, of course, no need to suppose that there would be doubt as to the reference when Jesus used the words; here is a case where tone or gesture would make the meaning clear and remove possible ambiguity.

More than you love these? With preachers, much more than with commentators, we find it common to make the question mean, "Lovest thou me more than thou lovest these?" The best of such interpreters link up the words with Peter's sudden abandonment of the boat and fishing gear. They also declare (as does Dr. Marcus Dods) that if Christ had meant "Lovest thou me more than these love me?" then "the second personal would almost necessarily he expressed; but as the words stand, the contrast is not between 'you' and 'these,' but between 'me' and 'these.'" This cannot be so decisive as it sounds, for the overwhelming majority of commentators accept the view which Dods criticises. Moffatt's rendering in his New Translation is, "Do you love me more than the others do?" and Weymouth similarly translates the passage.

Sometimes, in order to make a point, speakers support their choice of readings by the suggestion that there was special reason for Christ's asking Simon if he loved him more than he loved his fishing gear and the old life. Probably many readers of this have literally "suffered" the words of exhorters who say that Simon's having been on a fishing expedition on the Sea of Galilee is proof that he had gone back to his old life, and that consequently there was need of the question, Will you put me before these things? This manner of speech is wholly unwarranted, and distorts the Scriptures. Every reader should know that the despair and doubt of the disciples at the crucifixion of the Saviour had been removed by his resurrection and two appearances to groups of apostles, and one to Peter individually, prior to the appearance recorded in John 21, which is described as "the third time that Jesus manifested himself to the disciples [i. e., to a group of such], after that he

was risen from the dead." The command not to depart from Jerusalem till they were endued with power from on high was given later to the apostles, and was obeyed by them. Moreover, the presence of Simon and the other apostles in Galilee, so far from being evidence that they had lost their faith and gone back to the old life, was proof of their obedience to the word of Christ who had told them to depart into Galilee, he would meet them (Matthew 28:8, Matthew 28:10, Matthew 28:16; Mark 16:17, cf. Matthew 14:28).

Gross ignorance may explain but cannot excuse the attempt to make a point with an audience at the expense of the good name of the apostles. They were in Galilee at Jesus' command; and there is not, in John 21:1-25 or elsewhere in the Gospels, a hint that they were doing an unworthy thing in going fishing. The thought that this indicated a renunciation of their apostolic work is ludicrous. To show the lengths to which some will go, we quote from a recent writer who refers to Peter and the fishing in the following terms: "After having lived in a state of high pressure for three years, a moral and spiritual listlessness had set in. Life had lost its force: there was no light ahead. Dejected, overwhelmed with the dread re-action from those years of exaltation, Peter gave himself up to black depression. And now from the far past came memories of youthful days. In his ears sounded the lap of the waters on the lake side, the rattle of tackle, and the grind of boat-keels on the pebbly shore. In a moment the call from the past is answered; he must make some response to the inward urge for immediate action. He would make those three years as though they had never been: 'I go a-fishing.' And the others replied, 'We also go with thee.' There is something rather wonderful in that manifestation of comradeship in despair." Most of this is sheer imagination, and if we asked for justification there could be no adequate response. It is a gratuitous, if unconscious, libel perpetrated for the purpose of making a sermonic point.

We are far from suggesting that all who read our Lord's question to mean "Lovest thou me more than thou lovest these?" are guilty of such an offence as the foregoing indicates. Some of them are reputed exegetes and draw excellent lessons from their reading. To many a man to-day, to numbers of Christians who are in danger of allowing too great an encroachment of worldly cares, or too great an absorption in business, and possibly to some readers of this, the appropriate question of our Lord would be: Do you love me more than you love these? There was no more insistent demand made by Christ than that he be given first place. One must not love father or mother more than him. We must hold earthly possessions loosely, be prepared to renounce all, and turn the back on self; else we cannot be his disciples. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness." The familiar injunction summarises a great deal of our Master's teaching and finds the highest exemplification in his own life of consecration. This great demand may be indicated to us in the question, "Lovest thou me more than these?"

More than these love me? The writer, however, has no doubt that the meaning of Christ's inquiry is, Do you love me more than these other disciples love me? There is one objection to this which some people apparently regard as insuperable. It is alleged that the Lord Jesus could not have instituted a comparison such as suggested. Dr. Marcus Dods, for example, asks, "Would the characteristic tact and delicacy of Jesus have allowed him to put a question involving a comparison of Peter with his fellow-disciples?" If the interpretation, which with the great majority of exegetes we accept, involved the view that it was our Lord who initiated such a comparison, the objection, we think, would be fatal. As it is, the words of Dr. Dods and those on his side seem to us singularly to miss the point. It was Peter himself who instituted the comparison. He had vaunted

himself above the other disciples, and had declared, "If all shall be offended in thee, I will never be offended."

He had, moreover, dared to contradict the Saviour when he foretold his sad denial, declaring, "Even if I must die with thee, yet will I not deny thee." Yet Peter's bold confidence and foolish boasting were speedily followed by a three-fold denial of Christ. His sad case forcibly illustrates the lesson of Paul's text, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." No wonder that the Lord Jesus had said: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan asked to have you (the word is plural and refers to the group of apostles), that he might sift you as wheat; but I made supplication for thee (the singular shows the special need of him who was most confident of his strength), that thy faith fail not." Our Lord's inquiry, Lovest thou me more than these love me? would bring all this to Peter's mind. It is indicative of a changed viewpoint, of a new humility and self-distrust learnt by bitter experience, that Simon did not answer Jesus' question. He did not say anything about loving Christ more than others; there could now be no vaunting of himself or depreciation of others. But with absolute sincerity Peter could declare, "Lord, thou knowest that I love thee." Thrice over, as if to offset the three denials, is this confession of love elicited. A three-fold charge to "feed my lambs," "tend my, sheep," and "feed my sheep", proved how fully the Saviour forgave him his lapse and restored him to fellowship and service. It was the complete rehabilitation of Simon. He had "turned again" and so was able to keep the exhortation "stablish thy brethren" (Luke 22:32).

Following this new charge, the Lord revealed to Peter that faithfulness to his renewed Call would mean the literal fulfilment of the promise, once given unthinkingly, that he would be willing to die with Christ. "When thou wast young, thou girdest thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not." In his last message to his brethren, Peter wrote, "The putting off of my tabernacle cometh swiftly, even as our Lord Jesus Christ signified unto me." Tradition which need not be doubted tells of his being a faithful martyr and sealing his testimony with his blood.

03.05. "Tears, Idle Tears."

"Tears, Idle Tears."

Hebrews 12:17.

There are few passages of Scripture which have made a greater or more poignant appeal than the narrative in the book of Genesis describing Esau's sale of his birthright for "a mess of pottage," and his later futile appeal to Isaac to bestow on him a blessing. The writer to the Hebrews, giving an exhortation to Christians to have constant faith, patience and godliness, urged them to look diligently,

"Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected: for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears" (Hebrews 12:16-17, (Common Version)).

Esau the profane.

We need not recapitulate the long narrative in Genesis 25:1-34 and Genesis 27:1-46, for it has been familiar to most of our readers since childhood. God had prophesied before the birth of the twin brothers, Esau and Jacob, that they should be the heads of two nations (Israel and Edom), and that the elder should serve the younger. Both parents, Isaac and Rebekah, showed unworthy favoritism, Isaac for Esau and Rebekah for Jacob; for which sinful folly both suffered greatly in later days. The sympathy of most readers has gone out to Esau. Jacob, the supplanter, had many unlovely traits. His readiness to take advantage of his brother's weakness was detestable. The subterfuge by which he impersonated Esau, deceived his father and obtained the blessing, would ordinarily be regarded as worthy of a sneak and cunning rascal. Who has not been moved by the lament of Esau: "Is not he rightly named Jacob? for he hath supplanted me these two times: he took away my birthright; and, behold, now he hath taken away my blessing." The pathos of Esau's last, vain appeal can hardly be excelled: "And Esau said unto his father, Hast thou but one blessing, my father? bless me, even me also, O my father. And Esau lifted up his voice, and wept."

We dare not excuse Jacob; he was in part mean and contemptible. Had his mother and he been content to rest in God's promises, the supremacy of Jacob and of Israel would have come about without the trickery and sin which caused them both so much ill. But the story reveals such defects in Esau's character as makes us acquiesce in the preferment of Jacob.

Esau, the writer to the Hebrews says, was a "profane person." Etymologically, the word "profane" means before or outside the fane or temple. "Inside the walls around the temple lay the sacred, undefiled garden, the loveliest spot in all the land. But the unwalled ground outside was common, and trampled bare by the foot of man and beast. Esau was 'a profane person'; his life was all spent outside the sacred enclosure, and he profaned every hallowed thing, treating it as cheap and vile." Esau did not prize the good; he "despised his birthright." He lived for the pleasure of the moment.

He could not curb his appetite, and was willing to exchange a lasting joy for a brief, present gratification. He succumbed to the temptation which overcomes many a weak, passionate, easy-going man to-day. Charles Kingsley has said: "It is natural, I know, to pity poor Esau; but one has no right to do more. One has no right to fancy for a moment that God was arbitrary or hard upon him. Esau is not the sort of man to be the father of a great nation, or of anything else great."

We must accept Kingsley's judgment in the last quoted sentence. Dr. Hastings points out that "even in his selfishness and meanness Jacob showed his sense of the superior value of things unseen and distant, and his willingness to make a sacrifice to secure them." He erred sadly by seeking in devious ways to anticipate or ensure the promise of God; but he had a capacity for greatness such as Esau never had. He was capable of the great transformation from Jacob the Supplanter to Israel the prince of God.

Tears and repentance.

Why Hebrews 12:17 comes within the scope of our present series of studies is because of the difficulty of saying what the writer meant us to understand as having been sought by Esau diligently with tears, and how he found no place for repentance. The structure of the verse is ambiguous; to punctuate even is to interpret, and of course there is no punctuation of Scripture texts with other than human authority. It would be interesting, if space permitted, to collate the different interpretations of the passage--a large number of them quite legitimate, if a few seem very foolish.

While other versions are worthy of quotation, three stand out above all others, our Common and Revised Versions and the American Standard Revised Version. We have quoted the first at the beginning of this article. The others, which read as follows, should be carefully compared with the more familiar rendering. The English Revised Version reads: "For ye know that even when he afterwards desired to inherit the blessing, he was rejected (for he found no place of repentance), though he sought it diligently with tears." The passage runs as follows in the American Revision.. "For ye know that even when he afterwards desired to inherit the blessing, he was rejected; for he found no place for a change of mind in his father, though he sought it diligently with tears." (The words "in his father" are printed in italics to indicate that there are no words corresponding to them in the Greek text.) What did Esau seek with tears?

Esau "sought it diligently with tears." Grammatically, "it" could refer either to the blessing or the repentance. Our English Revised Version by its punctuation shows that the translators referred it to the former. Nobody, questions the legitimacy of this, and a reference to Genesis 27:1-46 shows that it was the blessing for which Esau entreated with tears: "Bless me, even me also, O my father. And Esau lifted up his voice, and wept" (Genesis 27:38). We therefore accept this view. It is interesting to note that Weymouth substitutes the words "the blessing" for the "it" of the original, rendering the passage definitely, "he sought the blessing earnestly with tears."

It is quite possible, however that it was repentance which Esau sought with tears. Moffatt and Rotherham so translate the passage as to imply this. On this reading, whose repentance would it be? Rotherham gives no indication. The American Standard Revised Version says that of Isaac: Esau "found no place for a change of mind in his father." This was certainly true, the statement fits the Genesis story, that not even tears of entreaty made Isaac retract the blessing already given to

Jacob, and many modern commentators have adopted the interpretation. On the other hand, there are many who believe that a repentance of Esau's was meant. Thus Moffatt renders the passage: "He got no chance, to repent, though he tried for it with tears." if this were the case, then "repentance" must here be used, as Dr. Davidson says, "not strictly of a mere change of mind, but of a change of mind undoing the effects of a former state of mind--i. e., such a repentance as "would reverse the consequences of his profane levity and win him back the blessing." There was no possible way of undoing the consequences of his act.

We dismiss as impossible the view that Esau was anxious to repent (in its ordinary sense), and though he was so willing that he cried over it, he could not succeed. Farrar truly says that "if the clause means that Esau desired to repent, and no chance of repenting was allowed him, it runs counter to the entire tenor of Scripture." To us the most probable interpretation of the passage is that suggested by our English Revised Version that it was the blessing which was vainly sought with tears; and that, despite his intense regret at the lost blessing Esau did not repent. To be sorry at the consequences of our acts, to weep over lost privileges, is not repentance.

F. W. Farrar mentions the interesting historical fact that Hebrews 12:17 was one of the passages by which the Montanists and Novatians sought, in the second and third centuries, to justify their refusal to grant absolution to those who fell into sin after baptism. He also notes that this abuse of the passage led by way of reaction to a tendency to discredit the epistle to the Hebrews in the western church. In familiar lines Keble has sought to pass on and to generalise the teaching of our text:

"We barter life for pottage, sell true bliss
For wealth or power, for pleasure or renown. Thus,
Esau-like, our Father's blessing miss;
Then wash with fruitless tears our idle crown."

03.06. The Gift of the Holy Spirit.

The Gift of the Holy Spirit.

Acts 2:38; Romans 8:9. The Lord Jesus sought to cheer the drooping spirits of his apostles, who were saddened at the announcement of his departure from them by saying: "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you." The change that was wrought in these disciples by the coming of the Holy Spirit is revealed in the later Scriptures. They were transformed, energised, equipped for service and for witness. The power by which they spake could not be resisted. Simon, afraid when a girl called him a disciple, became indeed Peter, the rock-apostle who testified before the murderers of Jesus that he was the Messiah and Son of God. Not all the promises associated with the Spirit's presence and work in the apostles can rightfully be appropriated by believers, but it is evident that the best which the Holy Spirit can do was not limited to the apostolic company. The greatest gift is for all the people of God who will appropriate it. The power for Christian living and service is at our disposal. On the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles at Jerusalem, Jesus stood up and cried aloud: "Whoever is thirsty, let him come to me and drink. He who believes in me, from within him, as the Scripture hath said, rivers of living water shall flow." John adds that "he referred to the Spirit which those who believed in him were to receive; for the Spirit was not bestowed as yet, because Jesus had not yet been glorified." A neglected subject.

It has to be confessed that many Christians neglect unduly the New Testament teaching regarding the Holy Spirit. Dr. A. E. Garvie begins a recent article with the sentence: "Except in a few devout circles, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has in the history of the Christian Church been very generally neglected." This witness is true. The thought of the living, personal Christ is much more real to the ordinary believer than is that of the ever-present and indwelling Spirit. As Dr. Garvie puts it: "It may be admitted that the historical reality of Jesus gives to the content of the consciousness of the living Christ, in which the historical reality is, as it were, spiritually diffused and continued, a definiteness which any consciousness of the Spirit's presence and activity lacks. Further, few Christians have the assurance to maintain, as I have heard one Christian minister at least maintain, that they can by reflection in their inner life clearly distinguish and separate the fellowship with the living Christ and the working of his Spirit." But the failure thus to distinguish neither gives justification for a denial of revealed truth, nor proves the identity of Christ and the Spirit. Despite some recent statements to the contrary, we are sure Dr. Garvie is right when he says: "However intimately Paul relates Christ and the Spirit, so that whenever Christ is believed as Saviour and Lord, the Spirit is possessed, I am convinced that he nowhere identifies Christ and the Spirit, still less does he confuse them."

It is not with the Holy Spirit's work in and for the believer that we are now concerned, but with the fact of his indwelling. The great thought is of the highest mark of our discipleship. Believers are distinguished from non-believers by their possession of the Spirit. They have been "sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise" (Ephesians 1:13). They are thus marked as Christ's own. Here is

something beyond and above any work wrought in or for them. Christians have the supreme token of God's favor when he gives to them his Holy Spirit. There are two familiar texts which emphasise this wonderful method of divine discrimination between the worldling and the Christian. Of the Spirit, Jesus used the words: "Whom the world cannot receive" (John 14:17). To Christians the Apostle Paul wrote: "Because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Galatians 4:6). The gift promised at Pentecost. To the inquirers of Pentecost, pricked in their hearts by the message, the Apostle Peter gave a command and a promise: "Repent ye, and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38). What is this gift? There is a certain ambiguity which brings this text into our series. The "gift of the Holy Spirit" might be (a) a gift which is bestowed by the Spirit, or (b) the Spirit as a gift. There is a similar ambiguity in another much discussed text, Ephesians 2:20, where Paul speaks of Christians as belonging to the household of God, "being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets"--which is interpreted by some to mean the foundation of them simply because they laid it; and by others (with more reason) a foundation consisting of apostles and prophets.

Regarding Acts 2:38, it might be argued that, since in the parallel construction of John 4:10 "the gift of God" means a gift from God, so "the gift of the Holy Spirit" will mean some endowment or gift which the Holy Spirit bestows. Accordingly, there are to be found some who think the reference is to such spiritual gifts as certain members of the apostolic church received. These, however, are by the Apostle Paul otherwise described as "charismata" (1 Corinthians 12:1 ff.). There is no evidence at all that the "doorea" of Acts 2:38 is the "charisma" of 1 Corinthians.

There are other passages in Acts and the epistles, also, which make it clear that it is the Spirit himself who is promised, in fulfilment of Jesus' word in John 7:39. Thus in Acts 5:32 Peter and the apostles are represented as speaking of "the Holy Spirit, whom God hath given to them that obey him." Paul in 1 Thessalonians 4:8 writes that God "giveth his Holy Spirit." The Christian's body is in 1 Corinthians 6:19 described as "a temple of the Holy Spirit." The Ephesian Christians were urged to "be filled with the Spirit" (Ephesians 5:18). No amount of argumentation could make more definite the teaching of such passages. The badge of our sonship is the possession of the Holy Spirit. At Pentecost we have not only a fulfilment of the promise of power made to the apostles, so that they should be able to give their adequate witness; but we also have the beginning of the fulfilment of the promise of John 7:1-53 : that believers were, after Christ's glorification, to receive the Holy Spirit. It is well to consider these two promises apart. Pentecost marks the beginning of the dispensation of the Spirit. But the greatest thing in connection with the Spirit's Pentecostal manifestation was not the more spectacular baptism and speaking with tongues on the part of the apostles, but the promise of the bestowal of the Spirit upon every one who in humble faith surrendered himself to the exalted Christ and Lord.

Unchristian, without the Spirit.

There is a text which expresses the great truth a negative form. In Romans 8:9 the Apostle Paul writes: "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." This passage also may be read in two different ways, and so is classed as ambiguous, though there should be no real doubt of the meaning. In the chapter as a whole there is a certain ambiguity due to the fact that the Greek word "pneuma" is used either of the human spirit or of the Divine Spirit. The word can denote wind, air,

breath, life, or spirit. If the reader will carefully peruse Romans 8:1-39, and compare the Common and Revised Versions, he will find that the Common Version throughout prints Spirit with a capital "S," while in Romans 8:4-11 the revisers print the word six times with a small "s," indicating that the human spirit is meant. It is the very same word which in the same chapter the revisers printed ten times with a capital letter. The American Standard Revised Version and Moffatt's New Translation return generally to the view of the Common Version, while Weymouth and Rotherham agree more with the English Revision. There can be no finality regarding all the verses; there is a legitimate difference of view.

Regarding Romans 8:9, in the judgment of all the translators of the versions quoted "the Spirit of God" and the "Spirit of Christ" (there can be no intended distinction between these) refer to the divine Spirit, a personal Being and not a mere influence or disposition. The personality of the Spirit is clearly implied in Romans 8:11, Romans 8:16 and Romans 8:26; to raise the dead, to give testimony, to pray, to have a mind, are evidence of personality., and could not properly be predicated of an energy or influence.

There are two classes of people who do interpret Romans 8:9 as referring to the disposition of Christ. First, of course, all who deny his divine personality do so; but their general reasoning is weak and their view opposed to Scripture. In the second place, it is not uncommon for speakers who do believe in the Spirit's personality to use the text in an accommodated sense to enforce a needed lesson. They talk thus:--"If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." What was the spirit, or disposition, of Christ? One of humility, obedience, trust, self-sacrifice, devotion, fidelity, and so on. An admirable lesson is thus adduced, but one which in our judgment had much better be attached to another text. It is true that we should follow the example and imitate the character of our Lord; but that is not the lesson taught in Romans 8:9. The preacher should make his homiletics and his exegesis agree; else he may unintentionally mislead his hearers regarding important truth.

If we read Romans 8:9 in accord with John 7:39, Acts 2:38, Acts 5:32, 1 Thessalonians 4:8 and 1 Corinthians 6:19, we shall get its deepest meaning. This indwelling Spirit is God's highest gift to his people, that which distinguishes the believer from the unbeliever. It is of course true that when the Spirit dwells in the heart of the Christian, there will be produced the fruit of the Spirit--love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, and self-control. The Spirit helps our infirmity, strengthens us with might in the inward man, and enables us to reproduce in some measure the character of our Lord.

"Be filled with the Spirit."

We referred at the beginning of this study to a common neglect of the New Testament doctrine of the Spirit. We shall do well to remove the reproach of this neglect. As with the doctrine of our Lord's coming, that "blessed hope," so here--it is probably the common neglect of the scriptural truth which furnishes the occasion for the errors and extravagances of others. Extremes beget extremes. We shall lose, and also make others lose, if we minimise or ignore the working of the indwelling Spirit of God. With Alexander Campbell we would say that we "could not esteem as of any value the religion of any man, as respects the grand affair of eternal life, whose religion is not begun, carried on, and completed by the personal agency of the Spirit of God." We who have appropriated the promise of Acts 2:38 should give heed to the command of Ephesians 5:18 and

seek to be "filled with the Spirit."

We may close with Dr. Moffatt's translation of a well-known Pauline passage: "In him [Christ] you also by your faith have been stamped with the seal of the long-promised holy Spirit which is the pledge and instalment of our common heritage, that we may obtain our divine possession and so redound to the praise of his glory" (Ephesians 1:13-14).

03.07. On Giving Up Our Rights.

On Giving Up Our Rights.

1 Corinthians 9:18; 1 Corinthians 7:31. In two great passages the Apostle Paul deals with the Christian's rights and his great privilege in not living up to them. The word Paul uses can be legitimately translated in somewhat different ways, and this has given rise to some discussion as to his meaning. In reality there should not be the slightest doubt, since the context makes the apostle's intention quite clear. The word "katachraomai" is used only twice in the New Testament, in 1 Corinthians 7:31 and 1 Corinthians 9:18. A reference to a Greek lexicon will show that the following two meanings are possible in the passages cited: (1) to use to the uttermost or to the full, to use up; (2) to misuse, misapply, abuse. In each passage the Common Version translates by "abuse," which word in older English meant (as did the Greek word it was employed to represent) either of the two things, to use to the full, or to misuse. Unfortunately, the ordinary reader today must from the 1611 version arrive at the conclusion that the apostle is warning against an evil use, rather than urging or illustrating restraint in the use of even legitimate things. The loss in this is great; for there is no doubt of Paul's meaning. The Christian Preacher's Rights. In 1 Corinthians 9:1-27 Paul revealed to the disciples that when he asked them, for the sake of their example and influence on others, to be willing to give up their rights, he was but requesting that they adopt a principle by which he himself lived. In very skilful fashion, he combined this with a defence of himself against certain foolish remarks or insinuations of brethren hostile to himself. They had said that Paul was not all apostle as Peter was, and they cited in proof the fact that Paul did not receive support from the church, but instead labored with his own hands. In verse 18, Paul tells of his reward in service:

"What is my reward then? Verily that, when I preach the gospel, I may make the gospel of Christ without charge, that I abuse not my power in the Gospel" (Common Version).

Now, there are still to be found a few writers and speakers who, it may be charitably supposed, are ignorant of what has been noted as to the double meaning of "katachraomai" in Greek and of "abuse" in older English, and (what is less defensible) ignore the whole of Paul's former reasoning in 1 Corinthians 9:1-27, and who, therefore, arrive at the astounding conclusion that Paul indicates that it would be wrong for a man to receive support in his work of preaching the Gospel. Than this, nothing could be more un-founded, or more out of harmony with the argument. When the would-be exegetes go further and denounce a "paid ministry and brand as "hirelings" all who are supported in the work of the Lord, they are guilty of such an offence as cannot wholly be excused by ignorance. The proven right. In the first part of the chapter, Paul proves his right to certain privileges. He was not behind Cephas and other apostles in the right to lead about a sister-wife. He and Barnabas, it is inferred, had all equal right with others to "forbear working." If some cynical objector should suggest, "Yes, equal right--for neither had any," he may be encouraged to read 1 Corinthians 9:7-14, where the absolute right to receive support is argued and declared.

First the apostle refers to human analogies. A soldier on campaign is not required to pay his own expenses. Planters of vineyards, and keepers of sheep, get a living out of their labor. The apostles and missionaries might be regarded as soldiers on service; they were planters of churches; they were shepherds of the flock--they were not bound to pay their own charges. But human analogies could not furnish a final proof. Hence the apostle refers to the law of God. In the Old Testament God had said, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn"--a principle which Paul implies was certainly not limited to the case of oxen, but which could be extended to the plougher and sower. In 1 Corinthians 9:11 Paul applies the right to those who sow spiritual things. Again, the law of the temple service was appealed to by the apostle. The priests and Levites had an acknowledged right to maintenance in connection with the temple and altar. Lastly, in one closing verse Paul raises the question above all reasoning from analogies, whether drawn from human practices or divine law. He makes the declaration: "Even so did the Lord ordain that they which proclaim the gospel should live of the Gospel." That settles the question for all who believe in the Lord Jesus and accept the authority of his inspired apostles. It also enables us definitely to decide as to the rendering of 1 Corinthians 9:18, that we must read it not of the abuse which is misuse, but of the using of a right to the full. The English and American Revised Versions and Rotherham's translation all agree and make the meaning clear. The first of these reads as follows:- "What then is my reward? That, when I preach the Gospel, I may make the Gospel without charge, so as not to use to the full my right in the Gospel."

Ere we pass on, it may be of interest to note that the help which he refused from the Corinthian church Paul was willing to receive from the brethren at Philippi (see Php 4:10-17). There must have been special reasons operating at Corinth--involving grave danger of misrepresentation and hindrance to the work--and these persisted, for in his second epistle to the Corinthian disciples the apostle declared his determination to adhere to the rule of not accepting anything from them (2 Corinthians 12:14).

Reasons for abstinence.

It is abundantly worth while to consider the noble example of the Apostle Paul. He enunciates a principle of self-abnegation which we should adopt. We should be willing to give up our rights. Many a Christian worker has been helped by the apostle's example, and has with noble self-sacrifice spent himself in service without receiving any pecuniary reward. Men who act thus are to be honored. There must, however, be no slighting of others who are not free or able to act in this way. The reasons which Paul gives for his abstinence are worthy of attention. F. W. Robertson in his Expository Lectures sums them up as follows: "In order to do his work in a free, princely, and not a slavish spirit, he was forced to preach the Gospel, and for the preaching of it no thanks were due. If he did it against his will, a dispensation of the Gospel was committed to him, and 'woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel!' He was bound to do it. But he turned his necessity to glorious gain. That was his 'reward,' that is, made him rewardable--by forfeiting pay he got reward: and in doing freely what he must do, he became free. When 'I must' is changed into 'I will,' you are free. And so in a profession you dislike--an alliance which is distasteful--a duty that must be done--acquiescence is Christian liberty. It is deliverance from the law.

"His second reason was to gain others. 'For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more.' For this was only one instance out of many; his whole

life was one great illustration of the principle: free from all, he became the servant of all. He condescended to the mode of looking at life that was peculiar to the Gentiles with respect to their education and associations, to that of the Jews also, when form was expressive of a true reverential spirit. Nor less to the weak and superstitious; he sympathised with their weakness, tried to understand them, and to feel as they felt." To forego acknowledged rights and privileges for the sake of others is a worthy thing for a follower of the Christ of whom it is written that even he "pleased not himself."

Every disciple, and not merely the Christian preacher, might well imitate him who could say, "I can refrain from insisting on all my rights as a preacher of the Gospel" (Moffatt's translation of 1 Corinthians 9:18). *The Christian and the World.*

There is no problem which more constantly presents itself for solution than that of the Christian's relation to the world. It is apparent that in the apostolic days, as during all the subsequent history of the church, the question was discussed. The early environment of those who became Christians affected their viewpoint. On some points Jewish Christians were much more likely to be strict than were Gentile believers. It is clear to any reader of the New Testament that while some disciples adopted a very rigid code with which without warrant they sought to bind the consciences of others, there were many who took a dangerously lax attitude, and even a few who went so far in accommodation to the practices of unbelievers as to jeopardise their own souls and bring disgrace upon the church of God. The numerous apostolic warnings against love of the world forbid us to believe that our greatest problem--our young people's problem, as it is often erroneously termed is peculiar to the twentieth century. A helpful principle. In our judgment, there are few passages of Scripture more likely to be helpful in a consideration of the question than 1 Corinthians 7:31, where the Apostle Paul urges Christians, while using the world, not to use it to the full. Our English versions, Common and Revised, both have the word "abuse," translating thus: "And those that use the world, as not abusing it."

We have seen that the Greek word, and the word "abuse" in older English, meant either abuse in the sense of misuse, of use to the full. In the only other passage in the New Testament where the word occurs (1 Corinthians 9:18) the revisers translated it "use to the full," and Paul's argument demanded that meaning. It is a pity that our revisers were not consistent, for the whole treatment in chapter seven makes it clear that "using it to the full" is the proper rendering. While our English Revised Version has this proper reading in the margin, the American Standard Revised Version, Rotherham and Weymouth put it in the text.

Two classes of worldly things.

Worldly things, pleasures and activities, are of two classes. First, there are those which may be regarded as positively sinful or harmful in themselves. But, again, there are those which we cannot declare to be wrong in themselves, but with regard to the use of which special care should be exercised.

Regarding the former class, there is no doubt as to the Christian's attitude. It must be an uncompromising one, Worldlings may feel free to practise deceit or fraud: to depart from strict honor, purity or truthfulness; to indulge in gambling. Drunkenness, and such things; but to the Christian there can be no such liberty. When we are dealing with things evil in themselves, with

"abuses" in this sense, our rule is one of total abstinence. We must, indeed, "avoid the very appearance of evil" for such is the command of the Spirit of God. So far there will be little, if any, difference amongst Christians. We are thankful for the general willingness of disciples to keep from this kind of "abuse" of the world. But there is not the same unanimity with regard to the second class of worldly things. If we would all heed the injunction not to use the world to the full, there would be a immeasurable gain. Read 1 Corinthians 7:1-40, and it will be seen that "all the things mentioned in this series by the apostle are right things; and the warning is against being in bondage to those things which are in themselves right and good, and not against any criminal use of them."

"Not engrossed."

Consider Moffatt's translation of 1 Corinthians 7:29-31 :

"I mean, brothers, the interval has been shortened; so let those who have wives live as if they had none; let mourners live as if they were not mourning, let the joyful live as if they had no joy, let buyers live as if they had no hold on their goods, let those who mix in the world live as if they were not engrossed in it, for the present state of things is passing away."

F. W. Robertson points out that Christianity stands between the worldly spirit and the narrow religious spirit. The former says, "Time is short, take your fill; live while you can." The latter so looks upon all pleasure in this life as a snare and dangerous, and says, "Keep out of it altogether." "In opposition to the narrow spirit, Christianity says, "Use the world," and in opposition to the worldly spirit, "Do not abuse it. All things are yours. Take them and use them; but never let them interfere with the higher life which you are called on to lead." It must be borne in mind that this advice cannot be given in reference to a thing which is in itself evil.

Leave margins.

Really, the apostle bids us leave margins. One who acts on his advice will leave even a margin of the field of legitimate things mentioned. We are not to be living on the borderline. The Christian attitude is not that of the person who is always as king, How near can I get to the line separating church and world? The familiar story of the school books about the man seeking to engage a coachman should not be forgotten. One declared he could drive within an inch of a precipice. To make a greater impression a second said he could go within half an inch. But the man who got the position said that he did not know how near he could go, for it was always his aim to keep as far from the edge as possible. Borderline Christians are not getting the best out of life. They cannot get the greatest good or enjoyment out of their religion; and, besides, they are not helping others as they ought. Let us each one remember that a question is not settled for the Christian when it is decided that it is not wrong in itself. The further questions press, Is it wise? is it helpful? does it interfere with my enjoyment of spiritual things, or with my Christian influence?

Let us not attempt to use the world to the full. "Instead of being moulded to this world, have your mind renewed, and so be transformed in nature, able to make out what the will of God is, namely, what is good and acceptable to him and perfect" (Romans 12:2, Moffatt's translation).

03.08. The One Thing Needful

The One Thing Needful

Luke 10:41-42.

Every lover of the word of God has a special interest in the beautiful passages of the Gospels wherein are recorded the visits of our Lord to Bethany and the home of Lazarus, Martha and Mary whom he is specially said to have loved. It appears that in the closing days of his ministry, when the dark clouds were gathering, our Master often found comfort and consolation in the house of his devoted friends. The character of the sisters is so wonderfully and consistently drawn that the narratives are favorites with us all.

We deal now with one incident recorded alone by Luke. Martha received Jesus into her house; Mary "also sat at the Lord's feet, and heard his word." Martha was "cumbered (literally distracted) with much serving," and came to Jesus to complain about the neglect of her sister. In her excited state, she not only condemned Mary's alleged unfairness but even reflected upon the Lord Himself. Moffatt's rendering is graphic: "Lord, is it all one to you that my sister has left me to do all the work alone? Come, tell her to lend me a hand." This was presumptuous language to use to the Master, and ordinarily Martha would not have been so peevish. It is the tender and yet reproofing answer of Jesus which now engages our attention. There is no essential difference between the texts of our English and Revised Versions and the American Standard Revised Version.

"But the Lord answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art anxious and troubled about many things: but one thing is needful: for Mary hath chosen the good part, which shall not be taken away from her" (Luke 10:41-42).

Types of character.

Difference of opinion still exists as to the comparative worthiness of the characters of Martha and of Mary. Each has so many admirable points, and each so appeals to people of different temperaments, that considerable opposition might be aroused by a criticism of either. It is Martha, of course, who is usually criticised in our addresses; and almost invariably some hearer--probably, some sister--is roused to defend the busy housewife of Bethany. The defence may be necessary in some cases where undue depreciation is made, but nothing is more certain than that our Lord himself gently reproofed Martha and commended Mary as having chosen the good part which should never be taken away from her. All interpretations or estimates which lose sight of this essential thing are to be shunned.

We do not unduly reflect upon the world's Marthas when we point out that their characters are defective:

"She who hath chosen Martha's part. The planning head, the steady heart, So full of household work and care, Intent on serving everywhere, May also Mary's secret know, Nor yet her household cares forego;-- May sit and learn at Jesus' feet, Nor leave her service incomplete."

Frequently the contrasted characters of the sisters have been made basis of an estimate of the comparative values of lives of activity and contemplation. Thus J. E. Macfadyen writes: "Martha and Mary are sisters, and their virtues are sister virtues- Martha, the symbol of strenuous energy, Mary, the pattern of sweet contemplation. In the kingdom of God there is a place for both." There is truth in this, but the antithesis can be strained, and it is often strained in such a way as to be unfair both to Martha and to Mary. We do not know that Martha always neglected meditation and contemplation, and we are certain that Mary cannot be proven to have been merely contemplative. She was not lazy and neglectful of duty. Had she been so, were there the slightest hint of it on this occasion, our Lord would not have praised her as he did. Luke by the use of the word "also" (Mary "also sat at the Lord's feet") shows that Mary received the Lord as well as sat at his feet. Then, whereas distracted Martha was concerned about the credit of the house and special dishes to suit so honored a guest, Mary manifested a true appreciation of the Master and his wishes by also sitting and drinking in his word. He was the real host at a heavenly feast, while Martha's thoughts centred on her duties as hostess at an earthly dinner. As an extreme case of what some read into the contrasted characters the following may be noted. Macaulay, comparing Naples and Rome, the former where religion is accessory to civil business, the latter a city of priests, writes: "A poet might introduce Naples as Martha, and Rome as 'Mary.' A Catholic may think Mary's the better employment, but even a Catholic, much more a Protestant, would prefer the table of Martha." The wrong in this is not the preference for Naples, but the gratuitous assumption that the alleged position of Naples is well typified by Martha and that of Rome by Mary! The few, and the one.

It is chiefly because of a variant reading in the manuscripts that this passage comes into our studies of ambiguous texts. Our Revised Version puts in the margin a reading which has the support of some of the very best Greek manuscripts, and which seems to be greatly gaining in favor with scholars, viz.: "But few things are needful, or one." It is now generally assumed, rather than proven, that the allusion in the "few things" is to such dishes as Martha was busily preparing, and it is commonly taken for granted that the "one" also refers to a dish at table. One writer puts it thus: "Martha, it appears, then designed a meal on the grand scale--one of 'many dishes'-in order to do honor to Christ. In this she found her programme larger than her means to achieve it, and it was this that caused the 'distraction' and led to the display of pique against Mary. And the whole point of our Lord's answer was to defend Martha against herself. He was content with one dish." Now, we should not deny that this view yields some sense, but it is a great descent from the ordinary interpretation. We believe that our Lord could have inculcated the lesson of "plain living and high thinking," but not that that is what is urged here.

It should be clear to any reader that the marginal reading does not demand any more than the common text the view that the "one" refers to a dish at table. The "many things" which Martha was said to be worrying about probably included the elaborate dinner courses and dishes; and the "few things" may also refer to these. If so, the sense of the reading "But few things are needful, or one" is likely to be that expressed by Dr. A. B. Bruce: "There is need of few things (material); then, with a pause, or rather of one thing (spiritual). Thus Jesus passes, as was his wont, easily and swiftly, from the natural to the spiritual."

We feel compelled to agree with F. W. Farrar that "the context should sufficiently have excluded the very bald, commonplace and unspiritual meaning which has been attached to this verse--that only one dish was requisite." Rather, the "one thing needful" was "the good part" which Mary

chose and which could not be taken away.

What was Mary's "good part"?

It has often been noted that our Lord does not explain what "the good part" is. Various excellent things have been enumerated in attempts at solution. Probably the best way of approach is that given in the Expositor's Bible: "Can we not find the truest interpretation in the Lord's own words? We think we may, for in the Sermon on the Mount we have an exact parallel to the narrative. He finds people burdened, anxious about the things of this life, wearying themselves with the interminable questions, 'What shall we eat? and What shall we drink?' as if life had no quest higher and vaster than these. And Jesus rebukes this spirit of anxiety, exorcising it by an appeal to the lilies and the grass of the field; and summing up his condemnation of anxiety, he adds the injunction, 'Seek ye his kingdom, and these things shall be added unto you.' Here, again, we have the 'many things' of human care and strife contrasted with the 'one thing' which is of supremest moment. First, the kingdom, this in the mind of Jesus was the 'summum bonum,' the highest good of man, compared with which the 'many things' for which men strive and toil are but the dust of the balances."

We may also quote J. E. Macfadyen's comment: Jesus "does not tell us, but he shows us. One thing is needful. Look at Mary, and you will see it. There it is! or rather, there she is! for Mary is that thing incarnate. Sitting at the Master's feet, and hanging wistfully upon his every word, she is an immortal illustration of the truth which Jesus would bring home to the restless Martha, and to all those eager, strenuous spirits of which Martha is the type."

Readers of Moffatt's translation will have noted that his rendering is very different: "The Lord answered her, 'Martha, Martha, Mary has chosen the best dish, and she is not to be dragged away from it.'" This means simply that Moffatt reconstructs the text and follows quite different (and inferior) manuscripts, from those generally followed. The word for "part" in our text is "merida," which may be used of a "portion" of a meal. Moffatt of course does not here mean "dish" literally. His note is: "I translate 'merida' by 'dish,' to bring out the point and play of the saying. Jesus means that Mary has chosen well in selecting the nourishment of his teaching."

Mary put first things first. The quiet spirit of love and meditation, the desire for heavenly communion, the drinking in of the word and spirit of Jesus himself, the receiving of spiritual nourishment from him--these are far ahead of the bustling activity due to a thought that to satisfy Jesus' physical needs could be more pleasing to him than to sit at his feet as a humble and adoring disciple. G. A. Studdert Kennedy has put in verse in appropriate prayer:

"O Christ, have mercy on my soul, and when, Cumbered with serving, I forget my Lord, Come thou into the kitchen where I cook. And, while I dish the meal up, speak to me; Give me for human sorrowing new tears, New pity for the passion of mankind; Show me thy Love, and though my hands be hard, Keep my heart soft like Mary's, she is good, And God, my God, I want that goodness, too."

03.09. The Lord's Prayer.

The Lord's Prayer.

Matthew 6:9-13; Luke 11:2-4.

Some few persons are to be found who vigorously deny our right to attach the name "The Lord's Prayer" to the model prayer which our Lord gave to his disciples. They call the prayer of John 17:1-26 "the Lord's prayer" because he prayed it; and that of Matthew 6:1-34 "the disciples' prayer" because they were to pray it. This is not mere hypercriticism; but it is invalid. The prayer of our study is the Lord's in the sense that he is its author. Even the title seems to justify our selection of the theme for such a series as this.

Despite the frequent use of it, it is astonishing how many Christians have no knowledge of the different New Testament versions of the prayer. That in most common use does not follow exactly the rendering of Matthew or of Luke either in Common or Revised Versions. It is certain, also, that the Common Version contains matter lacking adequate manuscript authority. It is doubtless the case that large numbers of Christians would not regard the following as "the Lord's prayer" at all:

"Father, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins: for we ourselves forgive every one that is indebted to us. And bring us not into temptation."

Yet that is the entire prayer as it appears in the Revised Version of Luke. In Matthew, there is a longer account, which yet comes short of the form in common use. The simple explanation of the different readings in Matthew and Luke is found in the fact that our Lord on two separate occasions gave a model and not a set form of words. The different accounts given in the Gospels furnish the clearest proof that the apostolic church did not regard the Lord Jesus as giving a liturgical form of prayer. As a model the prayer remains the most wonderful and comprehensive of petitions.

Some alternative readings.

Nearly everything in the model prayer is clear and simple, but two or three points arise which justify the inclusion of the prayer in our present series of studies. The qualifying clause "as in heaven so on earth" is generally used with reference to the third petition alone, and that seems the natural treatment. But some prefer to take the words in connection with the first three petitions, thus:

Hallowed be thy name,) Thy kingdom come,) Thy will be done,) as in heaven, so on earth.

Grammatically, this is possible, and of course it gives quite good sense. That reading would remove the difficulty felt in connection with the second petition. To pray "Thy kingdom come," it is frequently pointed out, was appropriate when the kingdom was yet proclaimed as future; but it is not so to-day, for Christians have been delivered from the power of darkness and translated into

the kingdom of God's dear Son. For the development or the progress of the kingdom, for its coming in fulness and glory, we can all fervently pray.

Much discussion, most of it profitless, has taken place regarding the words "deliver us from evil" (Matthew 6:13). The word for "evil" in the original may be either masculine or neuter. Taking it as masculine, our revisers have rendered it "the evil one." The matter cannot be finally decided, and it is unimportant. There can be no practical difference in our being said to be delivered from evil or from him who is the author of evil. Our "daily" bread.

There is one word in the Lord's prayer which is puzzling. It is not only difficult, but it is quite impossible, in the present state of our knowledge, to give a final interpretation. That word is "daily"--one which the ordinary reader is apt to think of as one of the simplest words in the prayer. The Greek original is "epiousion," and it is found only in Matthew 6:11 and Luke 11:3, and nowhere else in literature. Scholars are still divided as to its derivation and meaning.

It should be quite clear to even the casual reader that the "daily" of Luke 11:3 cannot mean merely "every day," for that would be superfluous and tautological, seeing that Christ said "Give us day by day our 'daily' bread."

Roman Catholic and some Protestant interpreters have accepted the meaning of supersubstantial bread, i. e., bread over and above material substance. Put in its best form, this interpretation simply says that Christ "meant his disciples, in this pattern prayer, to seek for the nourishment of the higher and not the lower life." Those taking this view point out that this is in harmony with the rest of the prayer: "The whole raises us to the region of thought in which we leave all that concerns our earthly life in the hands of our Father, without asking him even for the supply of its simplest wants, seeking only that he would sustain and perfect the higher life of our spirit." That we should put spiritual nourishment above physical bread, and that we may pray for spiritual food, is undoubted; but we do not think this is the probable meaning of the passage. It seems to us better to take the common view that one petition of the Lord's Prayer deals with earthly needs. The prayer is a comprehensive one, dealing with both spiritual and physical requirements. A lesson in proportional values is taught in that the first part of the prayer deals with God-his holy name, his kingdom and his will; then we make request for ourselves also, and only one petition of the six relates to physical wants. It must be legitimate to entreat sustenance for even earthly life: and the very making of the petition shows that we recognise our absolute dependence upon God. After all, as Farrar remarks, "though we are spirits we have bodies," and in this prayer our Lord "recognises our human needs and bids us ask the All-Father that of his bounty they may be supplied."

There have been a few who have strangely thought this petition more suitable for men such as the apostles than for disciples to-day who may have well filled store-rooms and banking accounts. This objection seems a foolish one. We are all day by day dependent upon God. But for his constant care and providence where would our boasted provision be?

Very many scholars believe that daily bread means "bread for the coming day," and this follows the analogy of a similar Greek word and also gives excellent sense of itself. The prayer may be made at the beginning of a day, and in that case "bread for the coming day" will be "to-day's bread," and that would fit Matthew 6:11, "Give us this day our 'daily' bread." But "the coming day" might mean "tomorrow," and some definitely so regard it. For instance, Dr. Moffatt in his New

Translation renders Matthew 6:11 by "Give us to-day our bread for the morrow," and Luke 11:3, "Give us our bread for the morrow day by day." That is, we seek supplies for one day ahead. While this view is not impossible, and while it may not be excluded by Matthew 6:34 ("Be not anxious for tomorrow"), yet "the daily asking for to-morrow's bread does not seem quite natural." The English and American Revised Versions have the marginal reading, "our bread for the coming day," while the American has the additional alternative of "our needful bread." Rotherham puts "our needful bread" in the text definitely as his translation. For ourselves, while admitting that the matter must be left open, we incline to either of the meanings "bread for the coming day" (not necessarily "tomorrow"), and "bread for the day" in the sense of the needful or sufficient food. The latter view has much to commend it. The request then is for food required for health and strength. The prayer of Agur in Proverbs 30:8 has often been cited in illustration, "Give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with the food that is needful for me." Plummer's comment is worthy of notice. "We are not to ask for superfluities," he says. The petition will cover what is needed for culture and refinement, but it will not cover luxury or extravagance. What we need must not be interpreted to mean all that we desire; sufficiency and contentment will never be reached by that method. Contentment is reached by moderating wants, not by multiplying possessions."

There is a difference between Matthew and Luke which may be noted in closing. In the model prayer of the Sermon on the Mount the word for "give" is "dos" ("give in one act"); in the prayer given on the occasion recorded by Luke our Lord's word was "didou" ("be giving" or "give us continuously"). Farrar quotes Dr. Vaughan's comment on the different tenses: "Matthew touches the readiness, Luke the steadiness; Matthew the promptitude, Luke the patience of God's supply."

03.10. Making Friends of the Mammon of Unrighteousness.

Making Friends of the Mammon of Unrighteousness.

Luke 16:1-12. The Parable of the Unjust Steward has been a puzzle to many, and our Lord's injunction to his disciples to "make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness" remains to some an exegetical stumbling-block. There are difficulties in the passage of our present study, but there is nothing which should cause much trouble. The steward whose conduct is described was an agent or factor rather than merely a house steward. The management of affairs was left in his hands. Doubtless he had power to make contracts, fix prices and rents, and generally act for his master. The case of Eliezer in the house of Abraham (Genesis 24:1-67) or Joseph in the house of Potiphar (Genesis 39:1-23) may parallel that of the steward. Clearly a man in such a responsible position who abused his trust had much opportunity for fraudulent gain. This steward was accused of wasting his lord's goods, we know not how. Accordingly he was asked to give a report and statement of accounts, and received intimation of dismissal. To make provision for the future, he then determined to place his master's debtors under an obligation to himself, and made an agreement with them whereby a large proportion of the indebtedness was written off.

Exactly what the cunning arrangement involved is not indicated. Many believe that the debtors were tenants who were wont to pay a proportion of the harvest as rent, and that in the past the steward had charged to them the higher amount stated and paid to his lord the lower figure, pocketing the difference. This is possible. Others imagine that goods had been sold, and bills or notes of hand taken in acknowledgment of the indebtedness. It should be noted that the narrative does not represent this reduction of debt as an illegal or even a secret act. It was doubtless the case that while he was yet steward the man could legally fix and adjust prices, and there was no danger of his master's being able to proceed against the debtors for the greater amount. The bargain was valid, and the debtors or tenants remained permanently benefited. Needless to say, in their eyes the steward made no immediate gain out of the present transaction. The view that he let the debtors know of his position and won them over by hope of personal gain to be participators in fraud must be dismissed from our minds, though some commentators evidently accept it. The lord and the Lord's comments.

Jesus said: "His lord commended the unrighteous steward because he had done wisely." "His lord" of course means the steward's master, and not the Lord Jesus. "Prudently" is a better translation than "wisely." It will be noted that the use of this word carries with it no commendation or condonation of the steward's wickedness. The foresight and prudence even of an evil man may be praised. The lord of the parable is represented as having wit enough to appreciate the shrewdness and foresight of his employee even while that is directed against himself.

"The fraud of this 'steward of injustice' is neither excused nor palliated" by Christ. "The lesson to us is analogous skill and prudence, but spiritually employed." The words which immediately follow are the words of Christ. "The sons of this world," he says, "are for their own generation wiser than the sons of the light." This verse is frequently misquoted and as frequently misunderstood. Our

Lord neither meant nor said that the sons of this world are wiser than the sons of light. The poorest Christian is a much wiser man than the greatest person in the world who rejects Christ, and nothing in the text suggests the contrary. But "for their generation" the children of the world are wiser or more prudent. There are two ways in which this verse has been interpreted. One, that the sons of the world are wiser in worldly things than Christians are in the same worldly things. This may be true, but surely that is not the meaning. Rather, the sons of the world "make better use of their earthly opportunities for their own life time than the sons of the light do for their lifetime, or even than the sons of light do of their heavenly opportunities of eternity." Many illustrations of this appear. Contrast the diligence and singleness of aim of the successful business man of the world with the half-hearted service we often give to Christ and the church. We are familiar with the saying that if an earthly business were run as the church is it would inevitably become bankrupt. The church seeks to win men from sin--contrast the comparative attractiveness of church and picture show, chapel and hotel bar. The chief thing in our Lord's word seems to be that the children of the light "give not half the pains to win heaven which the children of the world do to win earth--that they are less provident in heavenly things than those are in earthly--that the world is better served by its servants than God is by us." "The zeal and alacrity of the 'devil's martyrs,'--'says Farrar, "may be imitated even by God's servants." A friend of money?

It is Luke 16:9 which has caused most discussion, and which comes within the class of ambiguous texts. According to the Common Version, the Saviour added: "I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." The Revised Version has some alterations, notably "by means of" for "of," and "it" for "ye."

There are some people who apparently think it impossible that Jesus advised the making of friends either of or by means of the mammon of unrighteousness, and some desperate expedients have been taken to remove the thought that he did so. One noted interpreter tried to solve the problem by translating as a question and giving an interpretation as follows: "Shall I say unto you, make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness? Nay, rather I say, He that is faithful in a little is faithful also in much," etc. Others who have hesitated to deal thus with the passage have been completely puzzled. A great advance towards a reasonable interpretation is made when we realise that "the mammon of unrighteousness" simply means money. It need not be money wrongfully acquired. It is called "mammon of unrighteousness by a figure of speech (metonymy), the qualities which characterise its common use being transferred to the thing itself." Weymouth translates, "the wealth which is ever tempting to dishonesty." The abuse of riches is more common than their proper use. As Dr. Marcus Dods says, "Take any coin out of your pocket and make it tell its history, the hands it has been in, the things it has paid for, the transactions it has assisted, and you would be inclined to fling it away as contaminated and filthy." No wonder that such expressions as "filthy lucre" or "mammon of unrighteousness" came to be employed even when there was no implication that in the particular case under notice there was any wrongful acquisition or expenditure.

Trench rightly rejects the view that wealth unjustly gotten, by fraud or violence, is referred to, saying: "The words so interpreted would be easily open to abuse, as though a man might compound with his conscience and with God, and by giving some small portion of alms out of unjustly acquired wealth make the rest clean unto him. But plainly the first command to the

possessor of such would be to restore it to its rightful owners, as Zacchaeus, on his conversion, was resolved to do; . . . and out of such there could never be offered acceptable alms to him who has said, 'I hate robbery for burnt-offering.' Only when this restoration is impossible, as must often happen, could it be lawfully bestowed upon the poor." But how could Jesus tell us to "make friends of" money, seeing that "the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil"? The word for "of" is "ek," meaning literally "out of," and the Revised Version translates "by means of." A man uses his money well, to help his fellows and relieve the poor, can make true friends by means of his riches. By prudent foresight the steward of the parable provided by use of unrighteous mammon friends who would later receive him; in a higher and better sense may Christians make friends with their money.

It be seen that there would be no special difficulty even if the meaning were "make friends of money." The man who lives to make money, who uses fraud or deceit in its acquisition, who spends it in riotous living, or who uses it selfishly, does not make money in the best sense his friend. It is injuring him as an enemy would harm him. But money may be made a friend, and become a minister of good both to him who gives it and to him who receives. We turn mammon into a friend, as well as make friends by means of it, "when we use riches not as our own to squander, but as God's to employ in deeds of usefulness and mercy."

Received into heaven. The friends made by the steward received him after his dismissal, and we are to make friends by means of money "that, when it shall fail [or, ye fail], they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles." It matters little whether the reading be "it," referring to money, or "ye, in allusion to the death of the disciples. Our use of money presumably ends with death. But many readers are left wondering who are the people who are to receive us into heaven, or the eternal tents. There are two explanations which seem worthy of note. One naturally refers the "they" to the nearest preceding plural noun, "friends" and though there is no pronoun at all in the Greek text very many expositors give this interpretation. Weymouth definitely translates "friends who . . . shall welcome you." Those who oppose this view generally point out that our reception into heaven is not by the favor of men, and so God and Christ are often said to be meant. Others refer us to the angels who carried Lazarus into Abraham's bosom. There is no incongruity in thinking of those we have helped as at least welcoming us in the life beyond, and it is certainly true that this view fits well, and perhaps best, with the analogy of the action of the friends of the steward. Dr. Marcus Dods expresses the meaning thus: "The parents whose closing years, you watched and sheltered at the sacrifice of the opportunities of your own youth, the children for whom you have toiled, the friend or relative whose long sickness you brightened and rewarded by unwearied affection, the acquaintance you kept from poverty by timely intervention, the lad whose whole life you lifted to a higher level by giving him the first step--all those whom you have so loved here that your service of them has been ungrudging and unthought of--these are they who will receive you into everlasting habitations."

It may be better, however, to regard the expression as being made with an impersonal sense (as in Luke 12:11; Luke 23:31). The underlying meaning is clear. It is the great lesson of Matthew 25:34-40, that they who will be accepted at last will not be those who have made a mere profession but those who feed the hungry, care for the poor, visit the sick, and minister to the needy ones whom Christ calls his brethren. The literal truth is that "the heart of love which prompts and induces us to do good to the poor fits us for heaven."

03.11. The Word's First Word.

The Word's First Word.

Luke 2:49. The silence which encompasses twenty-eight years of our Lord's earthly life is once broken. Luke the evangelist, who gives us the most detailed record of the infancy, tells us the one authentic anecdote of the boy Jesus. Not until the age of twelve years was a Jewish boy required to enter into the full obedience of an Israelite, and to attend the Passover. After this age, he became a "son of the law." Doubtless it meant much to Jesus to go up to the Holy City and witness the impressive ceremonial of the most sacred of feasts.

After spending the usual time in Jerusalem, Joseph and Mary joined a Galilean caravan and set out for Nazareth. To their consternation, Jesus was lost. Making anxious inquiry, the distracted parents returned to Jerusalem. After three days--probably one for the outward journey, one for the return, and one for search in the city--they found Jesus in the temple "sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions." We fear that some Christians have failed to appreciate this passage. There was nothing forward in Jesus' attitude; he is not represented as assuming any authority or acting the part of teacher. F. W. Farrar contrasts the Gospel story with what we find in the Apocryphal Gospels and other books, where a forwardness and presumption is implied which would have awakened the displeasure of the Rabbis, whereas Jesus had won their admiration by his modesty and intelligence. "He was 'sitting' at the feet of the Rabbis, 'hearing them,' i. e., trying to learn all which they could teach; and ingenuously, but with consummate insight, 'answering' the questions which they addressed to him." All the people who were present--apparently Rabbis and visitors alike--were "amazed at his understanding and answers," and Joseph and Mary too were astonished at the sight. The mother of our Lord let her natural anxiety manifest itself in a gentle rebuke, "Son, why hast thou dealt thus with us? behold, thy father and I sought thee sorrowing." The Father's business-or house.

Jesus' reply to his mother's inquiry and expostulation is variously rendered. The Common Version puts it: "How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" In the Revised Version the second question runs: "Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?" The literal meaning of the original Greek words is "in the things of my Father," and there is even yet some discussion as to which of the two famous English versions is preferable, though most scholars agree with the revisers.

"I must be about my Father's business." The words would furnish an excellent life's motto for the Christian. They give also a beautiful description of the life of him whose first recorded utterance we are considering, for it is written of him that he "went about doing good" and that he came to earth to do God's will. We might like to think that as a boy of twelve Jesus had declared his life's purpose and devotion as the common reading suggests. It is doubtless such thoughts which have made many cling to the words of King James's Version even while they have been convinced that the revision gives a more probable view. The sentiment and associations of the familiar rendering are so beautiful that it seems a pity to have to depart from it.

It has to be confessed, however, that the translation of the Revised Version has so much in its favor, and so fits the context, that we are practically compelled to adopt it. When Mary had complained about having to seek her son sorrowing. Jesus' appropriate remark was: "Seek me? Why did you need to seek me? Did you not know I must be here, in my Father's house?" Mary should have come at once to the temple.

It has been suggested by some writers that we might retain both renderings, A.V. and R.V. alike, taking one as primary and the other as secondary. There is no doubt that both make sense, and give excellent lessons; but it seems "certain that only one of the meanings was in the mind of the artless Child from whose lips they fell," and that meaning is given in the Revised Version.

"Thy father"--"My Father."

It will be noted that, taking either version, the boy Jesus is represented as answering Mary's reference to "thy father" by a declaration that it was God who was his Father. Mary of course, as Luke who records the story, knew that Jesus had no human father; but, as was quite natural, Joseph received the title as the reputed father, just as in Luke's own narrative we have mention of "his parents" (Luke 2:41). Now, however, Jesus reveals his consciousness of a special and divine origin and mission. The question has often been discussed: When did Jesus first become conscious of his divinity and of the redemptive purpose of coming to earth? No final answer can be given; for, in the absence of revelation, speculation is idle. But it is clear from his own words that at the age of twelve he was conscious that no man was his father but that he stood in a unique relationship to God.

It is surely most significant that in his first recorded utterance Jesus spoke of God as his Father, and that in the last sentence spoken prior to his death on the cross he also did so. "Father," he prayed, "into thy hands I commend my spirit," and having said this, he gave up the ghost." Pre-eminently Jesus came from heaven to earth to show men the Father and to bring them back to the Father. Fittingly, then, the first and the last of his recorded utterances should contain his greatest word. Between these was given the revelation of the character of God in the words and deeds of a perfect life. The example of Jesus.

Other thoughts inevitably associated with the incident are worthy of mention. We see Jesus' early love for and knowledge of the Scriptures. He later declared that man lives not by bread alone but by every word of God. He met all enemies--Satan, human foes and death itself--with weapons from the arsenal of the word. Again, his love for the temple, which he twice called his Father's house, is evident. In his careful attendance on religious services--in temple and synagogue--our Lord furnished an example to his disciples. Lastly, we have the beautiful record which says that, after his acknowledgment of God alone as his Father, he went down to Nazareth with Joseph and Mary "and was subject unto them." He was divine and yet human, so high and yet so lowly, beyond the greatest of earth in dignity and yet willing humbly and obediently to return to the peasant home and labor at the carpenter's bench. Well might we say, with Irenaeus of old: "He passed through every age, having been an infant to sanctify infants; a little one among the little ones, sanctifying the little ones; among the youths a youth." He left us an example, that we should follow his steps.

03.12. Why Callest Thou Me Good?

"Why Callest Thou Me Good?"

Mark 10:18.

Dante, the great Italian Poet, tells how, walking with Virgil through the Inferno, he saw

"The shade of him Who made through cowardice the great refusal."

In the first three Gospels we have the story of the rich young ruler, a man whose virtues elicited the love of Christ, one whose heart seemed set on heavenly things, and who yet when the testing time came was guilty of "the great refusal." The earnestness, zeal and humility of the young man are beautifully exhibited in the narrative. That he, a ruler of the people, should run to Jesus and kneel before him in the way, was an unusual and wonderful thing. Whatever may be wrong in his question, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" it at least betokened a good interest in heavenly things. His upright life is implied in his response to Christ's words referring him to the law. "All these things have I observed from my youth" is a statement made with evident sincerity. That it was not the empty boast of a religious trifler is manifest from the record of Mark, who at this stage tells us that "Jesus looking upon him loved him."

Despite all his attractive qualities, however, the young ruler failed to pass the test of Christ. Because he had great possessions, he would not sell his goods and give to the poor, but instead went away sorrowful." Turning his back on Christ, he turned it upon the life which his opening words seemed to indicate he was willing to seek first of all. He was not so much prepared as he thought he was to do anything and everything to obtain life eternal. Whether or not he ever turned again and complied with our Lord's conditions is not revealed. The Scripture record was given for our profit and admonition, not for the gratification of our curiosity.

"Good Master" and "good thing." For the purpose of our present study we are concerned not with the full story of the ruler, but only with his opening words and with our Lord's reply to them. It will help to have before us the accounts given by Mark and Matthew. In each case we quote the Revised Version.

"There ran one to him, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, even God" (Mark 10:17-18).

"One came to him and said, Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why askest thou me concerning that which is good'

One there is who is good" (Matthew 19:16-17). A difficulty which some devout readers have had with the various readings of the Gospels must be noted. Matthew represents the young man as asking about the "good thing" he should do, and so quotes Jesus as saying, "Why askest thou me concerning that which is good?" In Mark and Luke, however, the rich young ruler's epithet of

"good" is prefixed to "Master," and hence Jesus' inquiry ran: "Why callest thou me good?" The accounts can easily be harmonised. The ruler doubtless said, "Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" Then Jesus in reply takes up each "good"--"Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? Why callest thou me good? None is good, save one, even God." The words in Matthew, "One there is who is good" imply the evangelist's knowledge of the second question propounded by Jesus. Reference to the marginal readings will show that some ancient authorities give readings in Matthew identical with those in Mark; but taking our Revised Version as following the better attested text, the believing reader can easily harmonise the records. The assumptions of unbelievers.

There are many modern critics, however, who will have nothing to do with such reconciliation. They say that Mark, the author of the earliest Gospel, gives the accurate record, and shows that Jesus repudiated the epithet of "good" as applied to himself. It is further alleged that the author of the Gospel which we call Matthew's, writing after the dogma of Christ's sinlessness was being developed, and finding in the record of Mark, which he had before him, words which were inconsistent with that dogma, deliberately altered the narrative to avoid any appearance of conflict with the accepted doctrine of Jesus' sinlessness.

We have no wish to examine in detail the unfounded series of assumptions in this alleged explanation of unbelievers; for our articles are written to help true believers to understand the Scriptures which they accept as the product of the Holy Spirit's inspiration. However, it may be remarked that there is no proof whatever that Matthew altered Mark's record for the reason given or any other. It cannot be proven that Matthew is any less reliable than Mark. There is no proof that Christ could not or did not speak as both Mark and Matthew declare. There is not a shred of evidence to show that after Mark wrote and before Matthew penned his Gospel the dogma of the sinlessness of Christ had been developed. Our critical friends could not begin to prove that Mark did not believe in the sinlessness of Jesus. The interested reader will note that Mark's Gospel opens with the words: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." it will require something more than the mere statement of an unbelieving critic to give semblance of cogency to the view that Mark could think of the Son of God as one who sinned!

Again, Mark gives in the Saviour's words that he came "to give his life a ransom for many." Was the Ransomer too in need of a ransom for his own sin? The idea is unthinkable. But we need not be surprised at the strange expedients adopted by those who today make "the great refusal" of Christ and his word. To one other point in the objection we give somewhat more detailed treatment, because in support is adduced the question of Christ which brings the passage within the scope of our studies. Did Jesus repudiate the epithet "good"?

"Why callest thou me good? None is good save one, even God." This is a text in which some unbelievers exult and by which some Christians are puzzled.

There is no doubt either about the original reading of Mark's account or concerning the translation of the text. We may take it that our versions report accurately what our Lord said. Even so, it is possible to read, "Why callest thou me good?" in different ways and with different meanings. It is a matter of emphasis. If a person wishes to read into the passage a repudiation by our Lord of his own sinlessness, he has only to emphasise the "me" strongly and read: "Why callest thou ME good? None is good save one, even God." But let such a one recognise the fact that that is his

interpretation (or distortion) of the text. it is a wilful reading into the verse of something which makes it contradict the witness of Christ himself as well as the repeated witness of other writers of Scripture (John 6:69; John 11:46; John 14:30; 1 Peter 2:22; 1 John 3:5, etc.). There is no warrant for so reading this passage in Mark as to make it contradict the claim of him who challenged his enemies to convict him of sin. The attempt on the strength of this one verse to impugn our Lord's perfect sinlessness is as unfair as it is unwarranted.

If we emphasise the "why" of the question, there is excellent sense, the meaning is clear, and the passage harmonises with all the rest that is revealed by or concerning Jesus Christ. The ruler had come with a sincere desire to honor Jesus as a great teacher, and as one who would at all hazards possess eternal life. He came with a somewhat facile compliment upon his lips and also with a question regarding some good thing he could do. Jesus in his reply pulls him up, and bids him think of the word he is using and of its implications. Why is it, he asks, that you call me good? Do you realise what is involved in the use of that epithet?

Either the ruler should acknowledge Jesus as divine, and not simply regard him as a human rabbi, or else he should not use the title "Good Teacher." The words "none is good save one, even God" also cut away all just ground for that man's, or any other man's, conceit about his own goodness.

God--or not good.

Dr. Alexander Maclaren has an excellent comment on the passage: "Our Lord answers with a coldness which startles; but it was meant to arouse, like a dash of cold water flung in the face. 'Why callest thou me good?' is more than a waving aside of a compliment, or a lesson in accuracy of speech. It rebukes the young man's shallow conception of goodness as shown by the facility with which he bestowed the epithet. 'None is good save one, even God' cuts up by the roots his notion of the possibility of self-achieved goodness, since it traces all human goodness to its source in God. . . . How then can any man 'inherit eternal life' by good deeds, which he is only able to do because God has poured some of his own goodness into him? Jesus shatters the young man's whole theory, as expressed in his question, at one stroke. But while his reply bears directly on the errors of the question, it has a wider significance. Either Jesus is here repudiating the notion of his own sinlessness and acknowledging, in contradiction to every other disclosure of his self-consciousness, that he was not through and through good, or else he is claiming to be filled with God, the source of all goodness, in a wholly unique manner. It is a tremendous alternative, but one which has to be faced. While one is thankful if men even imperfectly apprehend the character and nature of Jesus, one cannot but feel that the question may fairly be put to the many who extol the beauty of his life, and deny his divinity, 'Why callest thou me good?' Either he is 'God manifest in the flesh,' or he is not 'good.'" No man is entitled to rest half way, and to reject the Saviour's divine authority while lauding his character in the facile way in which multitudes do so to-day. There are but the two forms of valid reasoning from the premises before us. Either--There is none good but God; Christ is good; therefore Christ is God. Or--There is none good but God; Christ is not God; therefore Christ is not good. Our faith is in the Son of God, who died for us, and set the perfect example of a sinless life; in the Lamb without blemish and without spot, by whose precious blood we are redeemed.

03.13. "Baptised for the Dead."

"Baptised for the Dead."

1 Corinthians 15:29. The famous passage in which the Apostle Paul refers to baptism "for the dead" was not at first included in this series of studies, as it was felt to be a text presenting difficulty in interpretation rather than ambiguity in the strict sense. There is, however, a certain degree of the latter, and in response to a suggestion the verse has been included. In 1 Corinthians 15:11-58, the great "resurrection chapter," the apostle sought to confute those who in his day were denying the resurrection of the saints. His chief point was that the arguments his opponents were using would apply also to the resurrection of Jesus Christ. If there was no resurrection, and no risen Christ, then the Christian faith was a vain thing, there was no salvation from sin, those who had fallen asleep in Christ had perished, and Christians who had entertained delusive hopes were of all men to be pitied most. However, by cogent argument Paul could prove the resurrection of Christ, and with that established the Christians could be sure of the future resurrection of departed saints.

It seems curious, after the Apostle Paul had reached the heights of triumphant declaration of the final conquest of the risen Christ, that he should then return to what seems to most readers a subsidiary as well as an obscure argument. A certain practice, he writes, was unmeaning if there were no resurrection of the dead. It will be well to quote his own words:

"Else what shall they do which are baptised for the dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why then are they baptised for them?" (1 Corinthians 15:29, R.V.). The Common Version punctuates differently, and at the end of the second question has the repetition of the word "dead" in place of the better attested pronoun of the revision, thus: "Else what shall they do which are baptised for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptised for the dead?" But there is no alteration of meaning, and we need not have little difficulty so far as translation is concerned.

There is, however, no agreement amongst scholars as to the precise meaning of the verse, and from the early centuries expositors have been perplexed. Some people have been very sure of the meaning, but wiser writers freely confess that certainty is beyond us. Dr. Plummer said that "with our present knowledge it is impossible to do more than determine the direction in which a correct solution may be found. It is possible to show what kind of interpretation the language of 1 Corinthians 15:29 requires; and, when this is done, other kinds of interpretation are excluded as impossible."

One writer has collected thirty-six different interpretations, and there is no likelihood that he gave an exhaustive enumeration. If the reader of this has any settled opinion at all, it is highly probable that he has some supporters. The defender of the quaintest view need not feel lonely!

Vicarious baptism.

It seems natural first to notice the explanation that Paul refers to vicarious or proxy baptism, in which a living man was baptised on behalf of a dead one, so that the departed friend might receive a benefit. The Mormons of modern times have revived this baptism for the dead, which we know was practised in the early centuries, after the apostolic age. Tertullian (died c. 220 A.D.) and Chrysostom (died 407 A.D.) tell us that it existed amongst the Marcionites of the second century; and Epiphanius (died 403 A.D.) says that there was "an uncertain tradition handed down, that it was also to be found amongst some heretics in Asia, especially in Galatia, in the times of the apostles." Chrysostom describes the practice: When a catechumen (i. e. one training for baptism and church membership) had died before receiving baptism, "they hid a living man under the bed of the deceased; then coming to the dead man they spoke to him, and asked him whether he would receive baptism; and he making no answer, the other replied in his stead, and so they baptised the living for the dead." Epiphanius states the purpose: "lest in the resurrection the dead should be punished for want of baptism, and not subjected to the powers that made the world." Chrysostom says he could not speak of the practice without bursts of laughter, and the early writers did not think that Paul was making any allusion in 1 Corinthians 15:29 to any such practice.

It is true that even a superstitious practice of the kind referred to would imply a belief in resurrection and future life, and so it could fit Paul's general argument in 1 Corinthians 15:1-58. An illustration might be drawn even from an evil thing. But we are persuaded that had Paul referred to such an unauthorised and grossly superstitious rite he must have condemned it. It is impossible for us to believe that he could have been content with the language he uses, if he had known that some of the Christians had so distorted the ordinance of our Lord's appointment. Further, there is no proof that proxy baptism existed in apostolic times, and it is much more probable that the later superstitious rite grew out of the fancied meaning of our text than that the text refers to an existing practice.

There is no proxy religion in the New Testament. Faith, repentance and obedience in baptism are all matters personal to the individual seeker for salvation. It is interesting to note that Dean Stanley, who believes that 1 Corinthians 15:29 refers to vicarious baptism (though of course he thought that practice to be superstitious and unauthorised), should seek to show a certain connection between later church practices with their alterations of New Testament and those of the people referred to by Paul. In his commentary on Corinthians Stanley writes: "This endeavor to assume a vicarious responsibility in baptism is the same as afterwards appeared in the institution of sponsors." It will be remembered that the church of which the Dean was a brilliant member and leader represents the godfathers and godmothers as making profession of faith and other promises on behalf of the infant to be baptised. We can but repeat, whether of ancient heretical baptism or of any modern practice, that no one person can believe, repent or be baptised for another. Stanley goes on to refer to what the Church of Rome has done to the other ordinance of our Lord's appointment, as illustrating the motive behind the proxy baptism of the heretics: "The striving to repair the shortcomings of the departed is the same which in regard to the other sacrament, still prevails through a large part of Christendom, in the institution of masses for the dead."

Some better interpretations.

(1) One of the interpretations which yet holds the field is found in the early Greek "fathers," that Paul refers to the ordinary Christian rite, which implies a belief in the resurrection. Evans in the "Speakers' Commentary" strongly defends this view, and would translate "with an interest in [the resurrection of, the dead," or "in expectation of [the resurrection of] the dead." The objections usually given to the view, however, are very strong if not demonstrative. viz.: (1) that the words "they who are baptised for the dead" suggest a special class rather than refer to the whole body of Christians. It would be an unnatural way of speaking if those who were "baptised for the dead" included all to whom Paul wrote as well as the apostle himself. Indeed, he seems in the very next verse to put himself into another class. (2) It may be doubted whether the preposition "hyper" can have this meaning. (3) The ellipse is too violent; the words put in brackets above have no place in the original text.

(2) A few scholarly interpreters have attached a figurative meaning to the phrase "baptised for the dead," making it stand for the baptism of suffering such as Christ was baptised with, a "baptism for the sake of [entering into the church of] the dead." The only merit of this is that it suits the immediately following verses which refer to Paul's suffering for Christ's sake. But, as has been objected, "this is a still greater strain upon the preposition, and is equally open to objection from the use of the third person and of the 'them' at the end of the verse."

(3) Some writers have imagined that deathbed or clinic baptism is referred to. This, however, was a post-apostolic practice, and, so far as we know, was not found in the first century. Besides, "baptism of the dying" could hardly be described as "baptism for the dead." Despite the great names of Calvin and others associated with this view, we may dismiss it also as impossible.

(4) Another view is well worth mentioning, and is of a very different class. It is, briefly, that Paul is referring to what is a common experience that "the death of Christians leads to the conversion of sinners, who in the first instance 'for the sake of the dead' (their beloved (lead), and in the hope of reunion turn to Christ." Professor David Smith adopts this view, and expresses it in the following words:

"What then does the verse signify? Observe that the phrase 'for the dead,' though ambiguous in English, cannot in the original mean, as the idea of vicarious baptism would require, 'instead of the dead.' The Greek preposition here signifies 'for the sake of; and it illumines the apostle's words when we recognise that these were sorrowful days at Corinth. It was a heathen city, and it appears that it had recently been visited by a pestilence (cf. 1 Corinthians 11:30). 'Many among them were weak and sickly, and not a few were falling asleep'--the Christian phrase for dying. As our Lord had forewarned his disciples, the gospel had enkindled strife. There was many a home where a husband or a wife, a son or a daughter, a brother or a sister had confessed Christ and been loaded with ridicule and abuse. And now when the believer had gone to his rest, his kinsfolk's hearts softened towards him, regretfully remembering his gracious pleading and their bitter words; and that they might meet him again in the blessed home, they turned to his Saviour and 'were baptised for the sake of their dead.' And this is the apostle's appeal to those who doubted the resurrection. Will you, he pleads, forgo that blessed hope?"

Professor G. G. Findlay, who in the Expositor's Greek Testament argues for this interpretation, says truly that "the hope of future blessedness, allying itself with family affections and friendship, was one of the most powerful factors in the early spread of Christianity." In closing, we suggest

that the two interpretations which most appeal to us are those numbered (1) and (4) above. If we cannot definitely decide between these, we confess that the closing view has made an ever stronger appeal to us as the years go by, so that we now regard it as the one with least difficulty and that which is probably correct.

03.14. "Sound Doctrine."

"Sound Doctrine."

Readers of what are called the Pastoral Epistles--the three letters in which Paul gives advice to Timothy and Titus, his youthful helpers in the Gospel--will have noted how there appears in each of them a word which Paul nowhere else uses. We have frequent mention of "sound" doctrine. This word occurs eight or nine times in these three short epistles. In 1 Timothy Paul refers to a number of grievous sins, as "contrary to the sound doctrine" (1 Timothy 1:10). A man who "teacheth a different doctrine" than the apostolic one and who "consenteth not to sound words" is condemned (1 Timothy 6:3). Timothy is exhorted to "hold the pattern of sound words" (2 Timothy 1:13). "The time will come" when men "will not endure the sound doctrine" (2 Timothy 4:3). A bishop must be able to "exhort in the sound doctrine" (Titus 1:9). Reproof must be given to unruly men and vain talkers "that they may be sound in the faith" (Titus 1:13). Titus has to speak "things which befit the sound doctrine" (Titus 2:1), so that aged men may be "sound in faith" (Titus 2:2). In his doctrine he is to show "sound speech, that cannot be condemned" (Titus 2:8).

Doctrinal preaching. The word "doctrine" is not a popular one. Only to a less degree than the word "dogma," it seems to repel. To call a man a "dogmatic" person is but one way of condemning him. To say that one preaches a "doctrinal" sermon would generally be regarded as adverse criticism. Yet the apostolic message was a most definite and dogmatic one, and the need of "sound doctrine" was insisted on by the apostle. There is a common modern antithesis between the preaching of Christ and the delivering of a doctrinal sermon. That distinction could hardly have meaning for the apostle. There is no possible preaching of Christ without the preaching of doctrine. All that the writer or reader of this knows of Christ comes from doctrine. "Doctrine" simply means "teaching," and the difference between one preacher and another in his utterances regarding Christ is not that the one gives doctrine while the other does not, but is a difference in the quality of the doctrine or teaching that is given.

He who reads the New Testament will see that doctrine is important. We have made unwarranted separations. Some say that conduct, not faith, is what counts for most. But conduct is rooted in faith, and what a man really believes in his heart finds an issue in his life. God would not have given a revelation of himself at the length he has in the Scriptures if it did not matter what a man believes. It is true that a faith which does not issue in a godly life, which does not manifest itself in works of beneficence and mercy, is worthless and dead. But it is also true that the real faith in the heart of a man determines what his actions will be. We wish to believe truth, and not error. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." So long as this word of the Saviour stands, so long will it be imperative to give careful attention to doctrine. "Take heed to thyself, and to thy teaching," wrote Paul to Timothy; "continue in these things; for in doing this thou shalt save both thyself and them that hear thee."

"Sound" in the faith.

One of our most familiar expressions is that which is given in praise to a speaker whom we call "sound." He is "sound in the faith," we say; or, he gives "sound doctrine." What do we usually mean by this? That he is an orthodox believer; that he accepts the revelation God has made; that he is free from "critical" or "modernist" tendencies. All this is to the good, and it may be useful to have a word like "sound" to serve as a label. There is no doubt that to Paul and his fellow apostles it was most important that the divine revelation should be accepted. Paul declared that "he received of the Lord" the things which he spake; and that he spoke "not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth." There was a sacred "deposit" of truth which he urged Timothy to "guard." Some heretics made "shipwreck concerning the faith." Christians were urged to "contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints."

While we are compelled to make it clear that the sacred truths of the Christian religion come to us as a deposit to be jealously guarded, yet we must also point out that it was not simply orthodoxy which Paul had in mind when he wrote of "sound words" or "sound doctrine." It has been easy for some to think that when Paul wrote of "the form of sound words" he meant something like a modern church creed, that by conformity to which a man's faith or utterances might be tested. But it was not so. In the ancient church there were no formularies such as are found to-day. The creeds were a later growth, and Paul referred neither to them nor to any mere safeguard of orthodoxy. The word "sound," which Paul uses, had not for him or his readers such associations as are common to-day. A comment from Alexander Maclaren will help to make Paul's meaning clear: "'Doctrine' conveys to the ordinary reader the notion of an abstract, dry, theological statement of some truth. Now, what the apostle means is not 'doctrine' so much as 'teaching'; and if you will substitute 'teaching' for 'doctrine' you will get much nearer his thought; just as you will get nearer it if for 'sound,' with the meaning of conformity to theological standard, you substitute what the word really means, 'healthy,' wholesome,--health-giving, healing. All these ideas run into each other. That which is in itself healthy is health-giving as food, and as a medicine is healing. The apostle is not describing the teaching that he had given to Timothy by its conformity with any standard, but is pointing to its essential nature as being wholesome, sound in a physical sense; and to its effect as being healthy and health-giving. Keep hold of that thought, and the whole aspect of this saving changes at once."

It is interesting to note that the word Paul uses in every case except Titus 2:8 ("hugiees") is employed in Luke's Gospel and in 3 John 1:2 in the sense of being whole or made whole physically. The word "hugiees" employed in Titus 2:8 is found in each of the four Gospels and in Acts, in all of which it is translated "whole" and is used of physical healing. Of New Testament writers only Paul uses either word in a figurative sense. It is interesting to see how in his old age the apostle adopted this striking metaphorical form of speech. It is one of the key words of the Pastoral Epistles.

Weymouth and Rotherham depart from the usual translation with its somewhat misleading associations. The former has a rich variety of expressions: "wholesome teaching," "wholesome instruction," "sound teaching," "healthy language" "robust in their faith." Rotherham uses the word "healthful"--"healthful" teaching, discourses, instruction-and the phrase "healthy in their faith."

"Healing, because it makes holy."

Maclaren points out that in the pastoral epistles Paul gives a long catalogue of things "contrary to the health-giving doctrine," and adds: "If the ordinary notion of the expression were it, that catalogue ought to be a list of heresies. But what is it? A black list of vices--'deceivers,' 'ungodly,' 'sinners,' 'unholy,' 'profane,' 'murderers,' 'manslayers,' 'whoremongers,' 'man-stealers,' 'liars,' 'perjured' persons. Not one of these refers to aberration of opinion; all of them point to divergences of conduct, and these are the things that are contrary to the healing doctrine. But they are not contrary, often, to sound orthodoxy. For there have been a great many imitators of that King of France, who carried little leaden images of saints and the Virgin in his hat and the devil in his heart. 'The form of sound words' is the pattern of healing teaching, which proves itself healing because it makes holy."

It is the message of "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God" which is wholesome and healing. Orthodoxy in the best sense is therefore implied in Paul's advice to Timothy and Titus; for there are not two ways of salvation; there cannot be two Gospels. "If you change the 'pattern of health-giving words, you lower the health of the world," writes Alexander 'Maclaren. "If you strike out from the 'pattern of health-giving words' the truth of the incarnation, the sacrifice on the cross, the resurrection, the ascension and the gift of the Spirit, the 'health-giving words' that you have left are not enough to give life to a fly." So even in the ordinary sense one has to be "sound" in the faith. In our own experience we have found the healing power of the Gospel, and now, as in love we proclaim the message, we would recognise its wholesomeness and health-giving power. It is healing and wholesome, for it is the message of him who came to be the great Physician of men, and who said, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life."

03.15. Mirrored Glory and Transformed Life.

Mirrored Glory and Transformed Life.

2 Corinthians 3:18. In 2 Corinthians 3:1-18 the Apostle Paul gives a wonderful contrast between the Old and New Covenants. That which came through Moses was with glory, but was far surpassed by the more glorious New Covenant which came through Jesus Christ. The former was a ministration of death and condemnation, and passed away. The latter is a ministration of the Spirit and of righteousness, and so remaineth. In extremely interesting fashion the apostle refers to an experience of Moses as an illustration of the transitoriness of the Old Covenant. When Moses went up to Mt. Sinai to receive from God the law which was graven on stones, the exceeding glory of Jehovah was reflected on his face, so that when Aaron and the children of Israel saw the brightness, they were afraid to come nigh him. Moses put a veil on his face, the result being, according to Paul, that "the children of Israel should not look stedfastly on the end of that which was passing away." To some readers this comment of the apostle seems to be inconsistent with the narrative in Exodus; for the common translation of Exodus 34:33 says that "till" Moses had done speaking with the people he put a veil on his face. The better translation of the Revised Version, however ("when Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil upon his face"), is quite in harmony with Paul's comment. The effect of the veil was to conceal the fading of the brightness. The apostle treats the evanescent glory of Moses' face as symbolical of the transitoriness of the law of which he was the representative.

Considering the hardness of the hearts of his Jewish brethren and their rejection of the Christ, Paul goes on to refer to a veil (not on the face, but on the heart) which kept them from seeing, the glory of Christ--a veil, however, which would at once be taken away if a man turned to the Lord, just as the veil of Moses was removed when he turned from the people and went in before Jehovah to speak to him.

"Beholding" or "reflecting."

It is with one verse in Paul's great chapter that we now deal. In this the apostle contrasts Christians with Moses:

"But we all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit" (2 Corinthians 3:18. R.V.). The Common Version has "beholding as in a glass" instead of "reflecting as a mirror," and it is interesting to note that the American Standard Revised Version returns to this view, with a translation as follows:

"But we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit."

Here are two different meanings attached to the verb "katoptrizomai," which is used in this place alone in the New Testament. There seems to be no difference of opinion among scholars as to two

things, first that the verb in the active voice means "to show in a mirror" or "to cause to be reflected"; secondly, that in the middle voice, (which is used in 2 Corinthians 3:18) the ordinary meaning is "to look at or behold oneself in a mirror." But this meaning of "beholding oneself in a mirror" clearly does not suit the context, and so other meanings have been sought, and there are two possible renderings. One is that which appears in the Common Version, American Standard Revised Version, and margin of the English Revised Version--"beholding as in a mirror." It is contended that "it is in accordance with analogy to say that if the active means 'to show in a mirror' the middle means 'to get shown in a mirror' or 'to behold in a mirror.'" Considering the array of scholars on this side, it seems impossible to condemn the rendering. Stanley objects that the context is against it. "Katoptrizomenoi," he thinks, "cannot be used of 'beholding' simply, because in that case the apostle must have used the word 'atenizo,' as already twice before, in 2 Corinthians 3:7, 2 Corinthians 3:13." Stanley strongly argues for the reading "reflecting as in a mirror," and seeks to answer the objection that there is no actual instance of the sense of reflecting, by saying that "the fact that a Greek writer like Chrysostom understood it here in that sense, shows that there was in his time nothing in the usage of the word to make it impossible. And this sense is undoubtedly most agreeable to the context."

We cannot definitely decide between the two translations, and it must be allowed that excellent sense can be obtained from each. We do behold in the mirror of the Gospel the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ, and it is true that as we contemplate him, the beauty of his earthly life, the moral grandeur of his character, and also the glories of his ascension and coronation, we are influenced, changed, transformed into the same image. For Paul Christ was emphatically "the Lord of glory" (1 Corinthians 2:8); they who contemplate him in his "glory" are in a sense transfigured. As one has said, "The contemplation of the image of the Son of God acts upon our moral and spiritual natures as the presence of God did upon the face of Moses. It causes us to shine forth with some of his glory. The humblest Christian who looks constantly to Christ as his Redeemer and Exemplar and Source of spiritual life, reflects in his own life something of the glory of Christ; and if he faithfully continues to do this he reflects it more and more, and goes from strength to strength."

If with the Revision we read "reflecting as a mirror," we put in the forefront the result of our contemplation of the glories of Christ.

Others will see that we have been with Jesus and learnt of him. The influence of our lives will be felt by them; in a sense they will see in our faces, as did the Israelites on the face of Moses, the reflected glory of the Lord.

Attempts have been made to combine the two renderings. Stanley gives one, though he admits it is far-fetched: "It is just possible that both meanings might be combined by an allusion to the bright metal mirrors then in use, so as to render it 'beholding the glory, as we look at a light in a bright mirror of brass or silver, which, as we look, is reflected back on our faces.'" Rotherham translates: "With unveiled faces receiving and reflecting the glory of the Lord." It is most unlikely that the two ideas can rightly be combined as a translation, but it is obvious to any one who thinks that both are harmonious with our Christian experience. The careful reader will note the significant contrasts which Paul makes between the experience of Moses and that of Christians. He says "We all with unveiled face." "The contrast is between the one Hebrew leader and the whole body of Christians. Then only one was illuminated, and his illumination was hidden from all the rest; now all are

illuminated, and there is no concealment." There is no veil-no need of concealment; "there is no fear, and there is nothing to hide." Much more important, in Christian experience the transformation is not temporary. The fading of the brightness of Moses' face was symbolical of the transitoriness of the Old Covenant. But, on the contrary, "we all . . . are transformed . . . from glory to glory." There is both a progression and a completeness and permanence in our transformation. It is also "from glory to glory" in that "the change proceeds from the moral splendour reflected in the Gospel, and results in splendour imparted to us."

"Even as from the Lord the Spirit." This last phrase of our text contains one of the most ambiguous of all New Testament constructions. The Greek words are "kathaper apo kuriou pneumatos." Dr. Plummer says: "It is impossible to decide with certainty what the words mean. Every possible translation has been advocated. Are the genitives in apposition? or is one dependent on the other? If the latter, which of the two is dependent? Is the definite or the indefinite article to be supplied in each case? If the definite with one and the indefinite with the other, which is to have which? May the article, whether definite or indefinite, be in either case omitted in English? May 'kuriou' be an adjective?" Here are the possibilities. Who dare confidently decide between them? The translation of the Common Version, "even as by the spirit of the Lord," is quite possible, but does not commend itself to us. Why in that verse should Spirit once be printed with the capital "S" to show that the Holy Spirit is meant, and once in 2 Corinthians 3:17 and again in 2 Corinthians 3:18 be printed with the small "s"? It seems much better to consider the reference throughout to be to the Holy Spirit. It is the opposite extreme to translate "from a sovereign Spirit" (i. e., "a Spirit who exercises lordship) making 'kuriou' an adjective." Rotherham comes near to this thought, though he treats "kuriou" as a substantive, when he translates "as from a Spirit that is Lord." This is practically the reading of the R.V. margin, "the Spirit which is the Lord." That Father, Son and Holy Spirit are divine persons is undoubtedly true, and there is nothing curious or difficult about calling the Spirit Lord. Dr. Agar Beet renders: "As from the Lord of the Spirit," which again is quite legitimate, but does not suit the statement of 2 Corinthians 3:17 any more than Rotherham's translation does. Paul in 2 Corinthians 3:17 says, "The Lord is the Spirit"; and probably the true rendering of 2 Corinthians 3:18 is that of both the English and American Revised Versions, "even as from the Lord the Spirit."

There are those who have stumbled at the apparent practical identity of the "Lord" and the "Spirit" in this chapter, and especially in 2 Corinthians 3:17, where there is little difficulty in translation. As Dr. Beet points out, "To turn to the Lord,' i. e., to receive Jesus as Lord, is to receive the Holy Spirit as the animating principle of our lives. By receiving the one we receive the other." Receiving the Lord and the Spirit, we are "renewed unto knowledge after the image" of God. "There is no transforming power so effectual as Spirit, and in this case it is the Lord Christ himself who is the transforming power. Spiritual agency is here at its highest. The most wonderful changes are not only possible but natural, when such a cause is operating."

03.16. Glory of God and Peace of Man.

Glory of God and Peace of Man.

Luke 2:14.

Alone by humble shepherds at Bethlehem was heard the song of the angelic host. Just as the circumstances of the birth of Christ were lowly in the extreme, so the announcement of that birth was made "privately, at midnight, and without anything of worldly pomp and ostentation."

We might have expected that the highest in the land, the secular rulers or the ecclesiastical leaders, would have been honored by first hearing the announcement; but, instead, lowly shepherds watching their flocks by night were the privileged ones. Bishop Ryle well remarks: "The saying of James should come into our mind, as we read these words: 'Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom, which he hath promised to them that love him?' (James 2:5). The want of money debars no one from spiritual privileges. The things of God's kingdom are often hid from the great and noble, and revealed to the poor. The busy labor of the hands need not prevent a man being favored with special communion with God. Moses was keeping sheep, Gideon was threshing wheat, Elisha was ploughing, when they were severally honored by direct calls and revelations from God. Let us resist the suggestion of Satan, that religion is not for the working man. The weak of the world are often called before the mighty. The last are often first, and the first last." The angel, and the angels.

Luke records two angelic utterances. One was the announcement of "an angel of the Lord." The other was the song of "the heavenly host." Each referred to the incarnation of the Son of God--the former "proclaims the transcendent fact," and the latter "hymns its blessed results."

"The angel" said, "I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all the people; for there is born to you this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." The closing words of this quotation might with equal accuracy be otherwise translated, though nothing better than the familiar rendering can be given. It is interesting to note that the precise combination does not appear elsewhere in the New Testament; and the translation could be either "Messiah, Lord," or "Anointed Lord" (R.V. margin), or "the Messiah, the Lord," or "an anointed one, a Lord." We shall do well, however, to retain the text of our Common and Revised Versions.

It is the song of the angels which now engages our attention, and which has a more especial right to inclusion in our series of studies. It is preserved alone by Luke, who loves to record angelic ministrations and who is "the first Christian hymnologist":

"Suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, "Glory to God in the highest, And on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased"" (Luke 2:13-14, R.V.). In passing, it may be noted that the word "praising" is in grammatical agreement with "host" and not "multitude." The suggestion is that "the whole host of heaven was praising God, not merely that portion of it which was visible to the shepherds." This word for praising is a

favorite one with Luke, and is not used by any other Gospel writer.

"Good will to men"--or "men of good will."

Regarding the substance of the angels' song, it will be noted that the Revised Version, quoted above, differs from the more familiar translation of the Common Version, which reads: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men." The difference between the two versions is primarily due to the fact that the translators were following differing Greek texts. The Common Version has the word "eudokia" ("good will"), nominative; while the text followed by the Revisers has a genitive "eudokias" ("of good will" or "of good pleasure"). The weight of manuscript authority is in favor of the revised text, though the marginal note should be regarded, that "many ancient authorities read 'peace, good pleasure among men.'" Even accepting the Greek text followed by King James's version, its rendering must be challenged in one particular. The preposition "en" cannot be translated "towards"; the meaning would have to be "good will among men."

Apart from the weighing of manuscript authority, of which the ordinary reader may know nothing, the internal evidence seems to favor the reading of the Revised Version. "The hymn consists of two members connected by a conjunction; and the three parts of the one member exactly correspond with the three parts of the other member." "Glory" balances "peace," "in the highest" balances "on earth," and "to God" balances "among men of good pleasure." Dr. Plummer remarks that "this exact correlation between the parts is lost in the common triple arrangement; which has the further awkwardness of having the second member introduced by a conjunction, while the third is not, and of making the second and third members tautological. 'On earth peace' is very much the same as 'good will amongst men.'" To the last objection of Plummer it could be answered that the peace on earth is between man and man, while the third part relates to "goodwill (of God) among men." But, judged by every standard, the Revision is superior to the Common Version; and here is a case where, despite familiarity and hallowed associations, we should be willing to exchange phrases dear to us from childhood for words which convey more clearly the heavenly announcement of the results of the incarnation of the Son of God.

Dr. F. J. A. Hort, a great scholar and one of the most influential members of the Committee of Revisers, preferred another translation of the passage. He followed the revisers' Greek text; but held that the first of the two clauses should end with "earth" and not with "God," thus: "Glory to God in the highest and on earth; peace among men of his good pleasure." The meaning, then, would be: "Glory to God not only in heaven, but now also on earth." It is evidence of the right of our text to be classed as "ambiguous" that this translation can be given]. While it is a possible one, however, it is not probable, and it has found but few supporters. Plummer notes that "it destroys the exact correspondence between the parts of the two clauses, the first clause having three or four parts, and the second only two." Not only is the symmetry destroyed, but the first part is overweighted, and the second is too meagre in proportion. The lessons of the readings.

Excellent sense is found in either Common or Revised Version, and though we prefer the revision, it will be well to consider the general lessons of the two renderings. In one of his letters, Darwin observes, "I always think the most perfect description of happiness that words can give is 'Peace on earth, goodwill to men.'"

"Glory to God in the highest." The angels put first things first. "Creation glorified God, but not so much as redemption." "The highest" will be "the highest places" or "heavens." Maclaren has an excellent comment: "The incarnation will bring 'glory to God' there; for by it new aspects of his nature are revealed to those clear-eyed and immortal spirits who for unnumbered ages have known his power, his holiness, his benignity to unfallen creatures, but now experience the wonder which more properly belongs to more limited intelligences, when they behold that depth of condescending Love stooping to be born. Even they think more loftily of God, and more of man's possibilities and worth, when they cluster round the manger, and see who lies there."

McLeod Campbell wrote: "Surely 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill towards men' are words which as yet belong more to prophecy than to history."

"On earth peace." In his "Ode on the Nativity" John Milton treated the peaceful condition of the world at the time of Christ's birth as significant or symbolical:

"No war or battle's sound Was heard the world around; The idle spear and shield were high uphung. The hooked chariot stood Unstained with hostile blood, The trumpet spake not to the armed throng; And kings sat still with awful eye As if they surely knew their sovran Lord was by."

This is a doubtful treatment of the situation. Farrar, dismissing it, says that "it was not in this sense that the birth of Christ brought peace." Primarily, we think of the peace of God which comes to the heart of man, of perfect peace between God and man, but also we think of "the peace which, once admitted into the heart, makes men live at peace one with another."

"Christ's work," writes Alexander Maclaren, "is to bring peace into all human relations, those with God, with men, with circumstances, and to calm the discords of souls at war with themselves. Every one of these relations is marred by sin, and nothing less thorough than a power which removes it can rectify them. That birth was the coming into humanity of him who, brings peace with God, with ourselves, with one another. Shame on Christendom that nineteen centuries have passed, and men yet think the cessation of war is only a 'pious imagination' The ringing music of that angel chant has died away, but its promise abides." Who have the peace? Not all men have the peace of God dwelling in them. Until men turn to him who was the Prince of Peace and imbibe his spirit and do his will they cannot have his peace. It comes to "men of good pleasure" or "men of good will," to "men in whom he is well pleased," or even (as Weymouth puts it) to "men who please him." It matters little which of these phrases we employ; the underlying meaning is the same.

God's promises are often misappropriated. The most gracious and precious promises are never unconditional. We must do more than admire them; we must seek to fulfil the conditions of enjoying them. Dante declares, "In his will is our peace." In doing that will we become pleasing to him and so receive into our hearts the promised peace, which can only come to those in whom God is well pleased.

"Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you" (John 14:27).

"Peace be unto you all that are in Christ" (1 Peter 5:14).

"Live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you" (2 Corinthians 13:11).

03.17. Faith and Its Assurance.

Faith and Its Assurance.

Hebrews 11:1.

Faith is the foundation principle of the Christian religion, that on which all else depends for its validity and efficacy. In the New Testament "faith" is used in different senses. The range of meaning is wide, from a belief on testimony to a full confidence in and reliance upon a divine person. Faith concerns at once the cognitive, emotional and conative aspects of mind. Not intellect alone, but feeling and will, must be engaged, if the faith is to be of any avail. There has been a distinct loss when faith has been treated as if it were synonymous with intellectual assent. The faith which saves not only leads us to believe in the testimony regarding Jesus Christ, but to give ourselves in loving surrender to him; it is confident, reliant trust in him as our Saviour.

One of the great New Testament passages dealing with faith is Hebrews 11:1, where the writer gives an interesting description of its nature. The verse, which is variously translated and interpreted, reads as follows in the Common Version:

"Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." The Revised Version reads as follows:

"Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen."

Faith's power of realisation. The word "hupostasis," which is in the Common Version translated "substance" and in the Revision "assurance" means "something which stands underneath," "foundation." "ground of hope or confidence, and so assurance itself." In the New Testament the word occurs elsewhere in 2 Corinthians 9:4; 2 Corinthians 11:17; Hebrews 1:3 and Hebrews 3:14. In one of these passages (Hebrews 1:3) the translation is "substance" in the sense of "substantial nature" or "essence." Christ is of the essence of God, "the very image of his substance." In the other three passages the undoubted meaning is "confidence," as even a casual reading will show. When we come to Hebrews 11:1 it will be found that the context does not so definitely decide the meaning. The reading of the Common Version must, we think, be given up. Vincent says that "the meaning 'substance,' 'real being,' given by A.V., Vulgate and many earlier interpreters, suggests the true sense, but is philosophically inaccurate. 'Substance,' as used by these translators, is 'substantial nature'; the real nature of a thing which underlies and supports its outward form or properties. . . . It cannot be said that faith is substantial being. It apprehends reality; it is that to which the unseen objects of hope become real and substantial. 'Assurance' gives the true idea. It is the firm grasp of faith on unseen fact."

Dr. Weymouth's translation seems to us to express the meaning admirably: "Faith is a well-grounded assurance of that for which we hope, and a conviction of the reality of things which we do not see." He adds in a footnote a helpful quotation from Vaughan: "Faith is that principle, that exercise of mind and soul, which has for its object things not seen but hoped for, and instead

of sinking under them as too ponderous, whether from their difficulty or from their uncertainty, stands firm under them, supports and sustains their pressure--in other words, is assured of, confides in and relies on them." The faith of a Christian, then, is the inner confidence which he has. Things which have not as yet appeared in actual form, but which are objects of hope, are by him apprehended as real. He is sure that his hopes will be realised, that the promises of God will be fulfilled. It is faith which gives us certainty of that which lies in the future. Just as Abraham left home and kindred, not knowing whither he went, but went forward trusting in the promises of God, so the Christian with serene confidence commits his way to the Lord and reckons that what God has promised is as good as received. We recall the Saviour's striking word regarding prayer. He said: "All things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye have received them, and ye shall have them" (Mark 11:24, R.V.). It seems, at first, impossible to speak of believing that ye "have received" them. But yet a great lesson is taught. The prayer has to be offered in faith, and he who prays according to the will of God should be confident of the Father's answer, which is to be considered as good as here when the conditions of acceptable prayer are fulfilled.

One writer has well summed up the teaching of Hebrews 11:1 : "Faith has a power of realisation, by which the invisible becomes visible and the future becomes present. While hope is the confident anticipation of a future regarded as future, faith appropriates that future as an experience of the present." The title deeds of faith. The comparatively recent discoveries of business documents and ordinary correspondence written in the Greek language about the time when the New Testament was written have revealed an interesting use of the word "hypostasis." The late Dr. J. H. Jowett in one of his sermons commented as follows on the discovery and its meaning: "Among other words which have been disinterred there is the word which in my text is translated 'substance.' How do you think they used it? You would find an ordinary correspondent, using that word, or a man who was going to select or buy a house, or a seller of a house, using that word with the content of 'title-deed.' When they wanted to use our equivalent to the word 'title-deed,' they used the word which is hiding behind the word here translated 'substance.' Many have come to believe that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews must have had this content in mind when he was trying to express his wonderful conception of Christian faith; for, look you, how life and color come into the word when we take this recovered meaning and insert it in my text: 'Now faith is the title-deed to things hoped for.' Yes, thrice blessed, the word leaps into actuality. It becomes fervid and full of color. You at once have the figure of a man with a title-deed in his hand to take possession of splendid estates. And to me the fine, significant figure is this, there are vast moral and spiritual estates waiting for their heirs, and faith is the title-deed which gives possession and makes them ours. Faith is the title-deed of a house. The house is yours. Faith is the title-deed to all the glorious things hoped for in the Word of God." The firm conviction of the believer. The second part of the description of faith deals with "things not seen," which include more than the "things hoped for." "The latter is restricted to that which is purely future," while the former includes "not only future realities, but all that does not fall under the cognisance of the senses, whether past, present, or future."

There has been and still is much discussion regarding the meaning of "elenchos," which in the Common Version is rendered "evidence," and in the Revised Version "proving." A usual meaning of "elenchos" is "proof," or "test," and many writers contend that "proof" must be its meaning here. Dr. Marcus Dods, who takes this view, says that "substantially the words mean that faith gives to

things future, which as yet are only hoped for, all the reality of actual present existence; and irresistibly convinces us of the reality of things unseen and brings us into their presence. Things future and things unseen must become certainties to the mind if a balanced life is to be lived."

Dr. T. C. Edwards in "The Expositor's Bible" is another who takes "elenchos" to mean "proof." He writes: "Faith is this assurance of things hoped for, because it is a proof of their existence, and of the existence of the unseen generally." The writer, he says, "intentionally describes faith as occupying in reference to spiritual realities the place of demonstration. Faith in the unseen is itself a proof that the unseen exists." God's thoughts, he concludes, have manifested themselves in nature, in the incarnation of his Son, in the redemption of sinners. But the intellect that knows these things is the good heart of faith."

Most interpreters, however, think that the writer here attaches a subjective meaning to "elenchos." "Proof" brings to men "conviction"; and so by a figure of speech, wherein the effect is put for the cause, the word here denotes "persuasion" or "conviction." On the whole, this seems to be the best rendering, and it is adopted by the American Standard Revised Versions, by Weymouth, Moffatt and Rotherham. The meaning simply is that the Christian is fully convinced, "has a firm inner persuasion of the existence of unseen things, even as though they were manifest to one's eyes."

Some of the choicest passages of Holy Writ deal with the reality and the supremacy of the unseen. "Our light affliction, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal" (2 Corinthians 4:17-18). In Hebrews 11:27 we have a great phrase which looks back to the description of faith at the opening of the chapter: Moses endured, "as seeing him who is invisible." There is a higher vision than that which comes through the physical eye. It is a great mistake to take for granted that all knowledge comes through the intellect, or that the only reality is that which can be apprehended by the so-called "five senses." The Apostle Paul made a prayer for his brethren at Ephesus: "That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him; having the eyes of your heart enlightened, that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, what the riches of his inheritance in the saints, and what the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe" (Ephesians 1:17-19). If one who was literally blind were to deny the glory or the reality of that field of vision on which we look, we should not be disturbed in mind, though we might pity him, whose deficiencies cramped his life and limited his understanding. We should be as little perturbed when those who have not "the eyes of their heart" enlightened deny the great spiritual realities by which we are surrounded. They who "walk by faith and not by sight" prove in their own experience the glorious reality of the spiritual life. This last comes very near to the thought of Hebrews 11:1-40, which deals with the lives of the great heroes of faith. The "for" of Hebrews 11:2 introduces a proof of the statement concerning the nature of faith. "Faith has power to see and realise the unseen, 'for' the experience of the fathers proves it." Their experience may be ours.

03.18. Light Which Lighteth Every Man.

Light Which Lighteth Every Man.

John 1:9. The beloved disciple had heard our Lord describe himself as "the light of the world," and the thought of Christ as the great illuminator, the source of light and goodness, was one on which he loved to dwell. In the prologue of his Gospel, the Apostle John refers to the Word who in the beginning was with God and was himself God, and tells how that Word was revealed to men and rejected by men.

It is our purpose now to note but one verse of John's beautiful introduction. In the Common Version, John 1:9 reads as follows:

"That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." The text of the Revised Version renders a little differently:

"There was the true light, even the light which lighteth every man, coming into the world."

Many translations and interpretations. The verse is capable of diverse translations and interpretations. It is ambiguous in that the phrase "coming into the world" may agree either with "light" or with "man." This will yield at least four possible and legitimate views. (1) Taking "coming" in agreement with "man," we may have (a) the view of the Common Version: an emphatic way of stating that no man is independent of that light, which "lighteth every man which cometh into the world." The redundancy of this expression is perhaps the chief objection to it. There is no difference of meaning between "every man" and "every man which cometh into the world." (h) The phrase might mean "lighteth every man as he cometh" (R.V. margin). "It would be hazardous on the strength of this phrase to make the moment of birth the time of one's illumination by the true Light. If on the other hand "coming" be in agreement with "light," the best rendering is (c) that of the text of the Revised Version. It is true that even here a certain ambiguity persists, for those who thus related "coming" to "light" have not agreed as to whether the interpretation is "was destined to come," or "was on the point of coming," or "was in the act of coming." (d) The sense might be "which lighteth every man by coming." This last is not a very probable meaning; for, as Westcott remarks, "the context does not call for any statement as to the mode of the action of the light; and the light illuminates by 'being' as well as by 'coming'." When Christ is described as "the true light," the word "true" is used in opposition to that which is imperfect or incomplete. The word "marks the essential nature of the Light as that of which all other lights are only partial rays or reflections. "Christ is the true, the genuine, the perfect light, just as he is 'the perfect bread' (John 6:31), and 'the perfect vine' (John 15:1), not that he is the only light, and bread and vine, but that he is in reality what all others are in figure and imperfectly."

It is difficult to say how much of John's prologue refers to the pre-incarnation days, and how much to the Son of God in the days of his flesh. Some discussion has taken place regarding the allotment of John 1:9. Many believe that the marginal reading of the Revised Version sets forth the truth, "the true light, which lighteth every man, was coming into the world," i. e., when the Baptist

was giving his witness the true light was dawning on the world. Moffatt emphatically expresses this view in what is an interpretation rather than a translation: "The real Light, which enlightens every man, was coming then into the world." There is no "then" in the original. Some modern commentators translate "the true Light . . . was coming into the world," but "was" and "coming" are so far apart in the Greek text that this is a very doubtful rendering. The light of every man.

Whatever difficulties of interpretation and translation exist, one outstanding thing appears, viz., that the Apostle John claims for the Lord Jesus that he is the Light "which lighteth every man." This is the constant statement in all the varied translations. It is the glory of this truth which makes us choose the text as a basis for our study. That every man who ever lived or will ever live on earth is indebted to him whom John calls the Logos or Word, who became flesh and dwelt among us, is one of the greatest truths of the wonderful prologue to the fourth Gospel. The true light "lighteth every man." The passage has been grossly misapplied, as if every man by nature had in himself light enough to know God and come to God apart from the revelation in the Gospel of Christ. Not only is there nothing in the passage or context to warrant this, but the thought is utterly opposed to the teaching of the prologue itself as well as of the rest of the book. It is the only begotten Son who has declared the Father, whom no man hath seen (John 1:18). "I am the way, the truth, and the life," said the Lord Jesus; "no man cometh unto the Father but by me" (John 14:6).

Partly, I think, because of the erroneous and extreme view to which reference has been made, many others have been kept from giving the apostle's words their due weight, and have hesitated to speak of that light as lighting "every man." Yet, surely there may be light in man without its having a brilliancy sufficient to so light his pathway that he will be kept from stumbling or have no need of the light of the Gospel of Christ. The comment of the late Bishop Westcott may be quoted: "The words must be taken simply as they stand. No man is wholly destitute of the illumination of 'the Light.' In nature, and life, and conscience it makes itself felt in various degrees to all." The Apostle John claims that, wherever in the world there is light, it comes from the Word. All men, in so far as they are illumined, are lightened by the true light of God. Intellectually, light is knowledge; morally, it is purity. Wherever there is knowledge and purity, it has its source in him who is the true light." As Christ is the Spring and Fountain of all wisdom," wrote Adam Clarke, "so all the wisdom that is in man comes from him; the human intellect is a ray from his brightness; and reason itself springs from this Logos, the eternal reason." When we think of the true deity of Christ, that, as John says, "the Word was God," and that "all things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that hath been made," we shall not wonder at the boldness with which the apostle traces all human light and knowledge back to him as its ultimate source.

"Dependent on him," says Alexander Maclaren, "are the little lights which he has lit, and in the midst of which he walks. Union with Jesus Christ--'that light'--is the condition of all human light. That is true over all regions, as I believe. 'The inspiration of the Almighty giveth understanding.' The candle of the Lord shines in every man, and 'that true light lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' Thinker, student, scientist, poet, author, practical man all of them are lit from the uncreated Source, and all of them, if they understand their own nature, would say, 'In thy light do we see light.'"

There is another sense in which men to-day, even rejecters of the Gospel, are indebted to Christ the true light. There is not a single inhabitant of our land--blatant sceptic as well as humble

believer--who is not indebted to Christ. This is obviously true so far as his enjoyment of the privileges which Christianity has secured to men. The difference which Christ has made has affected for the better the external conditions of our lives. We may go further, and say that a man internally as well as externally may be benefited by the Gospel which he refuses to accept. He may unconsciously be its debtor as to character. There is a well-known sentence in "Sartor Resartus," in which Carlyle, through Professor Teufelsdröckh, says of his time of gloom, "From suicide a certain after shine (Nachsehlein) of Christianity withheld me." R. E. Welsh pointedly remarks, "In the sterling lives of good sceptics we often see this 'after-shine of Christianity.' The very qualities which set them in favorable contrast with many nominal Christians run back their roots, not to unbelief, but to the ethics and the diffused spirit of Christ." The very goodness of character, then, which, contrasted with the failures of weak Christians, is made an excuse for rejecting Christianity, should often rather lead to the acceptance of Christ who really is its Author. The thought of John in our text, however, carries us further back. He speaks not of Gospel light and benefits, directly or indirectly received, but of Christ as the source of all light and knowledge whatsoever.

03.19. "Not . . . But."

"Not . . . But."

There is a very large number of passages of Scripture in which truths are enforced or duties enjoined by placing them in contrast with something else: not that is true, or good, or required; but this. With many or most of these passages there is no difficulty and no ambiguity; the contrast is made absolutely. In other cases the thought is rather of the great superiority of one alternative to another, of the preference for one of the antithetical statements to the other. Occasionally, error of a serious kind has been fostered by a too literal reading, or by the assumption that the "not" phrase is intended to be wholly excluded. In some cases the meaning of "not . . . but" approaches nearly to "not only . . . but also," or it may be "not so much this as that." Or the thought introduced by the "but" is so important and so far above that of the contrasted phrase that to emphasise its superiority the other is as it were put aside from our consideration

It is our purpose now to note a few of the texts which are capable of being read in different ways. There is no difficulty about the translation; but by reading the negative phrase or clause in too absolute a way some interpreters have distorted the meaning of the Scriptures. A few passages of a more general type may first be noted.

Amongst these antithetical passages are some of the most cherished texts and several of the most beautiful sayings of our Lord. "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance" (Luke 5:32). "God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through him" (John 3:17). "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45). "I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me" (John 6:38). This last text is one of the class in which the "not" phrase must not be pressed to an extreme. In a sense Jesus did his own will, for there is no evidence of the slightest difference between the Father's will and that of the Son. Martin Luther once boldly wrote: "I do not ask, Thy will be done, but my will be done. For thy will is now my will, and I best get my own will by unquestioning acceptance of thine." We may hesitate about accepting that statement as wholly appropriate from the lips of a sinful man; but the Father's will and the Son's will were not in conflict. Even so, the text, "not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me," is one which it is important to notice. The Lord Jesus put God the Father first. Acknowledging, as we must, the deity of our Lord, we have also to accept the scriptural doctrine of the subordination of the Son to the Father who is "greater than all." There is a great example for us in the submission of the Son's will to the will of the Father. If he could pray, "Not my will but thine be done," well may we re-echo the petition. We might with profit accept as our life's motto the great quotation which fittingly describes the life's purpose of the Lord Jesus Christ: "Lo I am come to do thy will, O God."

Faith in the Father and the Son. At the feast at Jerusalem, "Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me" (John 12:44). Here, obviously, it would be ridiculous to read the "not" absolutely; in that sense, it would be an absurd contradiction to say,

"He that believeth on me believeth not on me." But manifestly the passage, in harmony with many other statements of the fourth Gospel, expresses the conception of the Son's entire oneness with the Father.

It is impossible for a person to have a true faith in Jesus the Son who has not a similar faith in God the Father. On another occasion Jesus said, "No one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him" (Matthew 11:27). The Lord Jesus came to reveal the Father to men and to show them the way to God. To believe in him was to accept him as God's ambassador and representative. Dr. Plummer well comments: "Jesus came as his Father's ambassador, and an ambassador has no meaning apart from the sovereign who sends him. Not only is it impossible to accept the one without the other, but to accept the representative is to accept not him in his own personality but the prince whom he personates." To acknowledge merely the beautiful life and example of Jesus, or to laud the greatness of his ethical teaching is not to have faith in him. He who truly believes in Jesus Christ believes in him as Son of God and revealer of the Father.

Jesus baptised not, but his disciples.

Giving reasons for our Lord's journey northward to Galilee, the Apostle John writes: "When therefore the Lord knew how that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus was making and baptising more disciples than John (although Jesus himself baptised not, but his disciples), he left Judea, and departed again unto Galilee" (John 4:1-3).

There have been some interpreters who have read the statement that "Jesus was making and baptising more disciples than John" as implying that the Lord Jesus personally baptised, and who therefore have been compelled to read the parenthetical words as meaning that Jesus did not do the baptising alone, but had the assistance of his disciples. This view is perhaps not impossible, but it is extremely improbable. A few regard the parentheses as a qualification or verbal correction of what John had previously written. This is a quite legitimate view. If we adopt it, then it had better be with the understanding that the correction is not of John's own statement but of the form of the Pharisaic rumour referred to in the previous verse. On the other hand, the words need not be read as a correction of the rumour, for it is a sound maxim that what one does by another he does himself. With the vast majority of interpreters, we accept the view that the verse teaches that Jesus did not personally baptise. Why, it may be asked, did he refrain from doing so? It is frequently said that the reason was that "baptising is the work of a minister, not of the Lord." Again, it has been noted that Jesus had been announced as the one who should baptise in the Holy Spirit; and it has also been suggested that to baptise in water would be a very subordinate act and perhaps even appear a renunciation of the claim to be the greater One who should baptise in the Spirit? Possibly, though it is doubtful. One of the best reasons seems to us to be that had Jesus baptised any with his own hands, there would have been danger of too great an importance being attached to that circumstance, and of spiritual pride being engendered. In the Corinthian epistles there are references to some who in a special way claimed connection with Jesus, somehow vaunting themselves above others on that account. It can easily be imagined how, if some could have said they received their baptism at the hands of the Lord himself, they would have been tempted to undue exaltation on that account.

"Christ sent me not to baptise." In an oft quoted, and much misused, passage the Apostle Paul writes: "Christ sent me not to baptise, but to preach the Gospel" (1 Corinthians 1:17). The most casual reader of the passage ought to note that Paul cannot mean the "not" to be absolute, as if he had received no commission from Christ to baptise converts. The great commission of our Lord (Matthew 28:19-20) was acted upon by all the apostles. The Apostle Paul definitely says he did baptise some of the Corinthians--Crispus, Gaius, the household of Stephanas--with his own hands. There is no suggestion that in other places he had not sometimes personally baptised. If "Christ sent me not to baptise" be read too absolutely, then it could be thought that Paul in baptising broke the terms of his commission, which is absurd. At Corinth some were calling themselves by the names of favorite teachers, and Paul rejoiced that he had baptised so few of them, in case some should say they were baptised into his name, or lest some semblance of reason could be given for wearing his name.

Paul, we know, was accompanied on his missionary tours by a number of companions and helpers. To them doubtless was relegated the duty of baptising. They could do that as well as the apostle, leaving him free for the higher duties of his office which were beyond their powers. As Robertson and Plummer in their commentary say, "Baptising required no special, personal gifts, as preaching did. Baptism is not disparaged by this; but baptism presupposes that the great charge, to preach the Gospel, has been fulfilled." There is point in the statement of Meyer's Commentary, that "The absoluteness of the negative is not at all to be set down to the account of the strong rhetorical colouring. . . . To baptise was really not the purpose for which Christ sent Paul, but to preach (Acts 9:15, Acts 9:20, etc.); in saying which it is not implied that he was not authorised to administer baptism, but sent 'in order to baptise' he was not." Of those who would from this passage belittle the ordinance of our Lord's appointment, one has said that it would be well if persons thus offending were to remember the words of Bishop Butler: "As it is one of the peculiar weaknesses of human nature where, upon a comparison of two things, one is found to be of greater importance than the other; to consider this other as of scarce any importance at all: it is highly necessary that we remind ourselves how great presumption it is to make light of any institution of Divine appointment; that our obligations to obey all God's commands whatever are absolute and indispensable; and that commands merely positive, admitted to be from him, lay us under a moral obligation to obey them--an obligation moral in the strictest and most moral sense."

If anything more need be adduced to show how wrong it would be to discount the importance of Christian baptism because of this text, that can be found in the Apostle Paul's own experience and in the teaching of his epistles. To him had been spoken these words by the man sent by the Lord himself: "Why tarriest thou? arise and be baptised and wash away thy sins, calling on his name" (Acts 22:16). He has written as follows regarding the ordinance: "Are ye ignorant that all we who were baptised into Christ Jesus were baptised into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life" (Romans 6:3-4). And again: "Ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptised into Christ did put on Christ" (Galatians 3:26-27). It is incredible that the man who penned these words wished to belittle the ordinance of our Lord's appointment.

Mercy, and not sacrifice. At two different times (Matthew 9:13 and Matthew 12:7) the Lord Jesus quoted with approval the words of Hosea 6:6, and on each occasion effectively answered those

who cavilled at his practice or that of his disciples. The Pharisees were punctilious in their regard for external righteousness, but were harsh and censorious in their treatment of others whom they regarded as beneath them. They forgot the need of the inward qualities, a spirit of humility, love, mercy and judgment.

Curiously, there have been some readers who have inferred from the words quoted by our Lord ("I desire mercy, and not sacrifice"), and from similar passages elsewhere in the Old Testament, that sacrifice was repudiated altogether by the prophets. This is quite unwarranted. Sacrifice was of God's appointment. But without a heart of compassion, and offered without a spirit of obedience, the external rite was unavailing and unacceptable. As Samuel told Saul, "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams" (1 Samuel 15:22). It is the spirit of loving obedience which gives its value to sacrifice. The statement is put strongly to indicate the supremacy of the inward, mercy, to the external, sacrifice.

"The Hebrew form of speech here used denotes inferior importance, not the negation of importance." "Sacrifices in themselves, and when offered at the proper time and place, and as the expressions of penitent hearts and pure hands, were acceptable, and could not be otherwise, for God himself had appointed them. But soulless sacrifices offered by men steeped in sin were an abomination to the Lord; it was of such that he said, 'I cannot away with' them." Dr. Plummer well writes: "Of course the saying does not mean that sacrifice is worthless, but that mercy is worth a great deal more. Compare Luke 10:20, Luke 14:12, Luke 23:28; in all such forms of speech, what seems to be forbidden is not really prohibited, but shown to be very inferior to something else." The lesson taught by our Lord is of perpetual value. We are all prone to forget the true values of life. Some would get rid of too much of the outward observances, and the rites which are of divine appointment. They need to be reminded of Jesus' words, "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments." But others are in danger of attaching too much importance to externals, and of neglecting the disposition of the heart. The prophets of the Old Testament have a lesson for them. Idolatrous systems only required the regular observance of a prescribed ritual; Jehovah was satisfied with nothing less than the devotion of loving hearts. Hosea, as the other prophets, showed that "God cared more for goodness and piety--the knowledge and doing of his will--than for formal offerings and sacrifice, and nothing at all for religious observances that were insincere and corrupt"; and that "ritual without love is an abomination:" As the observances of religion become the habits of our daily lives, let us beware of the sin of formalism, remembering that "everything depends on the right disposition," which is what God supremely desires.

We close with a quotation from Alexander Maclaren: "Hosea had said long ago that God delighted more in 'mercy' than in 'sacrifice.' Kindly helpfulness to men is better worship than exact performance of any ritual. Sacrifice propitiates God, but mercy imitates him, and imitation is the perfection of divine service. Jesus here speaks as all the prophets had spoken, and smites with a deadly stroke the mechanical formalism which in every age stiffens religion into ceremonies and neglects love towards God, expressed in mercy to men."

03.20. To the Uttermost.

To the Uttermost.

John 13:1; Hebrews 7:25.

Two of the most beautiful verses of Scripture deal with the Master's love and with his ability to save. We are told that there is no limit, that he loves and saves "to the end" or "to the uttermost."

Love to the uttermost. In introducing the events which took place in the upper room on the night of our Lord's betrayal, the Apostle John writes:

"Now before the feast of the passover, Jesus knowing that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end" (John 13:1).

Instead of the last three words, the R.V. margin has "to the uttermost:" The great majority of translators here prefer the reading "to the end," and the phrase ("eis telos") is used in that sense in the New Testament and out of it. In Matthew 10:22, for example, we have no hesitation in reading, "He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved:" But the words are just as adequately translated by "full," "completely," or "in the highest degree:" In 1 Thessalonians 2:16 we all agree that the phrase is used in this sense; hence the common translation, "The wrath is come upon them to the uttermost:" There is another common meaning, "at last," which some think is the meaning both here and in Luke 18:5, where the phrase also occurs.

It matters little whether in John 13:1 we translate "to the end" or "to the uttermost:"

Each rendering gives a blessed truth and each is in harmony with the context. Alexander Maclaren takes the one view. "It was more to John's purpose," he writes, "to tell us that the shadow of the Cross only brought to the surface in more blessed and wonderful representation the deep love of his heart than simply to tell us that that shadow did not stop its flow." That is, the Saviour always loved his apostles, but now in the hour of crisis and facing the bitterest experience of his life he carried his love to the highest point. Dr. Marcus Dods says that the meaning is that Christ "loved them through all the sufferings and to all the issues to which his love brought them. The statement is the suitable introduction to all that now looms in view. His love remained stedfast, and was now the ruling motive."

If we might combine the views, we should certainly get truth. On that night of betrayal, Christ's unflinching love was perfectly displayed.

Able to save to the uttermost. In Hebrews 7:25 there is a beautiful passage, one of the favorite texts of many a reader, which tells us that Christ "is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near to God through him, seeing that he ever liveth to make intercession for them." The phrase here translated "to the uttermost" is "eis to panteles," which has precisely the same ambiguity as has the "eis telos" of John 13:1. Moffatt translates "for all time," instead of "to the uttermost," which

is quite legitimate. The meaning may be that no matter to what length sin has gone, Christ is able to subdue it and save from it; or the reference may be to time, Jesus' permanent priesthood being contrasted with the temporary function of the Aaronic priest who by reason of death was not suffered long to continue his service. In one of his expository articles Professor David Smith deals with this verse. He says: "It appears that the phrase signified, as the Revisers have it in their marginal rendering of the passage before us, 'completely' or more literally 'without any limit' whether of time or of extent or of degree. Primarily indeed it is time that is intended here, since the immediate theme is the permanence of our Lord's priesthood; but the corollary thereof is the finality, completeness, and all-sufficiency of his atoning sacrifice, and if we limit the phrase to time, then we impoverish the passage by ignoring those glorious truths which are its main burthen." Of the meaning of the phrase for us, Dr. Smith writes as follows:

"1. 'He is able to save to the uttermost of time.' He is the Eternal Saviour, 'the same yesterday and to-day, yea and for ever.' What he was for Peter and Mary Magdalene and the Dying Thief, that he is for us now, and will be for all who trust him 'to the last syllable of recorded time.' What he was in Galilee and Jerusalem he is evermore in his glory; and what he was to us when we first believed, he will be to us still even to the end of our journey, according to the ancient promise: 'Even to old age I am he; and even to hoar hairs will I carry you.'

"2. 'He is able to save to the uttermost of human depravity.' For his sacrifice for sin was an infinite sacrifice, 'an atonement for our sin, and not for ours only but also for the sin of the whole world.'

"Its streams the whole creation reach: So plenteous is the store-- Enough for all, enough for each, Enough for evermore.'

"3. 'He is able to save to the uttermost of the sinner's day of grace.' Misericordia Domini, said St. Augustine, inter pontem et fontem, 'There is mercy with the Lord betwixt the bridge and the brook.' And what this means is illustrated by an epitaph taken by William Camden, the Elizabethan antiquary, from the tombstone of 'a gentleman who, falling off his horse, brake his neck, which suddain hap gave occasion of much speech of his former life.'

"My friend, judge not me, Thou seest I judge not thee: Betwixt the stirrop and the ground Mercy I askt, mercy I found.'

"There is life for a look at the Crucified--even at the last moment." As we close, we may note a further remark of Professor Smith regarding the ambiguities of the New Testament text. It is worthy of remembrance in connection not only with Hebrews 7:25, but also with the other ambiguous passages which we have studied. "Where a phrase in the original is vague," he says, "it is always well in translation to reproduce its vagueness and refrain from precise definition; else we substitute interpretation for translation, and even where our interpretation is true, narrow the original and eliminate much of its precious significance." The remembrance of this wise remark will help us much in our appreciation of the sacred text and our estimation of the value of the numerous translations now in common use. There is very frequent substitution of interpretation for translation.

03.21. Closing Prayer

Closing Prayer

Blessed Lord, who hast caused all holy Scriptures to be written for our learning; Grant that we may in such wise hear them, read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest them, that by patience, and comfort of thy holy Word, we may embrace, and ever hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life, which thou hast given us in our Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
 - 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net